# NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

# CURRENT AND PROPOSED SECURITY RELATING TO THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

# MASTER PLAN FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS AND RELATED AREAS

(98-52)

# HEARING

BEFORE THE

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 15, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
36-667 O WASHINGTON : 1984

H641-24

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey, *Chairman*

GLENN M. ANDERSON, California
ROBERT A. ROE, New Jersey
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
NORMAN Y. MINETA, California
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
HENRY J. NOWAK, New York
ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
FOFO I.F. SUNIA, American Samoa
KATIE HALL, Indiana
DOUGLAS H. BOSCO, California
JAMES F. McNULTY, JR., Arizona
JIM MOODY, Wisconsin
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
TIM VALENTINE, North Carolina
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI, Illinois
MICHAEL A. ANDREWS, Texas
TOM J. VANDERGRIFF, Texas
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
JAMES McCLURE CLARKE, North Carolina
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
NEWT GINGRICH, Georgia
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
GUY MOLINARI, New York
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., Florida
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
FRANK WOLF, Virginia
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
HAL DAUB, Nebraska
LYNN MARTIN, Illinois
VIN WEBER, Minnesota
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
DON SUNDQUIST, Tennessee
NANCY L. JOHNSON, Connecticut
RON PACKARD, California

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri, *Chairman*

JAMES McCLURE CLARKE, North Carolina
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
KATIE HALL, Indiana
MICHAEL A. ANDREWS, Texas
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey
(Ex Officio)
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., Florida
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
GUY MOLINARI, New York
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
(Ex Officio)

## CURRENT AND PROPOSED SECURITY RELATING TO THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

### WITNESSES


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Russ, Hon. Jack, Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives | 3 |
| Trollinger, James T., Acting Chief, U.S. Capitol Police | 3 |
| White, Hon. George M., Architect of the Capitol | 3 |


## MASTER PLAN FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL


H.R. 4332: To approve the master plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and related areas, and for other purposes ..... 19


### WITNESSES


Alder, Thomas P., Chairman, Task Force on the U.S. Capitol Master Plan, Capitol Hill Restoration Society, Inc. ..... 59
Prepared statement and resolutions ..... 47
Broshar, Robert, President, American Institute of Architects ..... 43
Prepared statement ..... 36
White, Hon. George M., Architect, U.S. Capitol; accompanied by Elliott Carroll, Executive Assistant ..... 24


### ADDITIONS TO THE RECORD


Grinnell, David, Chairman, Committee of 100 on the Federal City, letter and resolution ..... 63
McClinton, Curtis Jr., Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, Government of the District of Columbia, statement of John H. McCoy, Director, Office of Planning ..... 66

# CURRENT AND PROPOSED SECURITY RELATING TO THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

---

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Robert A. Young (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. YOUNG. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds will please come to order.

I would like to welcome the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Howard, to the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. The subcommittee is meeting today to review current and proposed security measures for the Capitol Building complex.

As chairman of the subcommittee I believe the challenge to all of us is clear: How do we insure the proper level of security for the Capitol Building complex without stripping our constituents and the general public of easy access to their own seat of government? Should we install a fence around the Capitol Building itself similar to the fence at the White House? Should we limit vehicular access to the east plaza? These are just a few of the measures which should be reviewed. Obviously, there is a distinct possibility that any terrorist group may plan future bombing attempts, and increased efforts from all sectors of our Government must be undertaken to correct this outrageous intrusion on a free society. We propose to look to the experts for the answers and find out what steps need to be taken to improve security before a tragedy does take place. We should not wait for lives to be lost.

The subcommittee had invited officials from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Secret Service to appear. However, due to the ongoing investigation of the recent bombing on the Senate side of the Capitol, I decided it would be unadvisable for them to appear based on the extremely sensitive national security issues involved.

I would urge the press to be prudent in the reporting of this hearing since publicity of this nature tends to encourage threats from the sick minds of terrorists that plant the bombs which only hurt everyone.

It is my understanding the first politically motivated bomb attack occurred in 1915. We in Congress have wrestled with how to

protect ourselves and the public ever since. To my knowledge, since 1981, there have been approximately 11 bombings in Federal buildings across the country and the insular territories. Recent news accounts report that the Honorable William Webster, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated that at least half of the 11 bombings were related to international terrorist groups. If the bomb which destroyed the Marine headquarters in Beirut were ever employed in the Capitol, I fear to imagine what would happen, but I suspect it would probably be one of the greatest tragedies to occur in the Nation for years.

To conclude, the problem with adequate security only seems to be growing worse rather than better, and as such, means must be found to provide the maximum security possible for all Americans alike.

The subcommittee also proposed to receive testimony on H.R. 4332, a bill to approve the master plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and related areas, and for other purposes. In this regard, I would like to emphasize that this is merely a guideline for long-range future development of the Capitol Grounds if, and when, Congress so determines additional development is necessary. As my colleagues are aware, most cities across the Nation usually formulate a master plan for any future economic development in order to qualify for Federal community development block grants or any other Federal/State program.

We are pleased to have with us today numerous distinguished officials to present testimony on these two issues. At this time, I would like to welcome all of the witnesses, and recognize the distinguished ranking minority member for an opening statement.

Mr. Shaw, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. SHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the early 1790's, President Washington rode to the top of Jenkins Hill with Mr. L'Enfant. At that time Mr. L'Enfant said with amazing accuracy and predicted that he would build on Jenkins Hill a Capitol for 50 States. What Mr. L'Enfant did not realize and what General and President Washington did not realize is the tremendous problems and complexities of the 20th century that this Capitol would have. With 850 doorways, 658 windows, 540 rooms, this Capitol presents a nightmare of security even for the 1,200 Capitol Police that we have. That is a police force that is larger by three times than the police force of my own home town of the city of Fort Lauderdale, FL. This latest bombing of the Capitol is the third bombing to take place, the first was in 1915, when a bomb was planted on the Senate side by a former Harvard professor who was then protesting World War I. In 1971, again on the Senate side, there was a bombing by the Weathermen who were protesting the Vietnam war. Now in 1983 we have a bombing that we do not know the reason for. We cannot secure this Capitol beyond the reach of every radical that there is in the world today, but we must do more than we have been doing. In doing so, however, we cannot close off the greatest democracy in the world. The Capitol of the United States is and must remain accessible to the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment you for scheduling this hearing this morning. I think it is something that we will have to talk more

about both in open and executive session. I look forward to hearing today's witnesses.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Shaw, for your fine statement.

Mr. Clarke, do you have a statement?

Mr. CLARKE. I have no statement at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Andrews, would you care to make an opening statement?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have no statement at this time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. No, I do not wish to make a statement, Mr. Chairman. I just want to congratulate you and the members of the subcommittee for holding this hearing. As you know, this subcommittee has the total jurisdiction over the Capitol and its Grounds, and I agree with statements that have been made that this is a very, very difficult situation with the makeup of not only the Capitol Building but the other buildings here. I certainly am sure that these hearings will show that there has not been any negligence on the side of any of the people with the responsibility in this area. I think that they are doing a good job under the circumstances of the physical makeup of these buildings and garages and everything around them. I hope that we may be able to come out of these hearings perhaps with some new ideas as to how we might make it better, considering the statement that was made by Mr. Shaw, also. We certainly will never stand for in this country a fortress for our Government. So what we have to blend is the rights and the openness and the democracy that we wish to have for the people who come here and visit to watch their Government in action, and yet do all we can in every practical way to assure the safety of those people in the Capitol itself.

Thank you for holding these hearings.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to associate myself with your remarks.

At this time I would like to welcome the Honorable Jack Russ, Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable James T. Trollinger, Acting Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, and the Honorable George White, the Architect of the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. Russ, would you like to lead off?

## TESTIMONY OF JACK RUSS, SERGEANT AT ARMS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; HON. JAMES T. TROLLINGER, ACTING CHIEF, U.S. CAPITOL POLICE; AND HON. GEORGE WHITE, ARCHITECT, U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. RUSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a detailed statement but because of the sensitive nature of the information I cannot present it in open hearing. I would like to say that I have appeared before my authorizing committee, the Subcommittee on Police Personnel, and the Committee on House Administration, and they have given me preliminary approval for certain security procedures and devices for the Capitol. These devices and procedures for installing them were developed primarily with the help of the Secret Service which did a complete security analysis for us back in the winter of this year, and we intend to install and implement these devices as soon

as the House adjourns. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I cannot go into much detail, but I am free to answer some of your questions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Russ, how would you characterize the present state of security at the Capitol in the wake of the Senate bombing?

Mr. RUSS. We have expanded the metal-detection devices and we have well-trained police officers who man these metal detectors. We have extended our perimeter from the third floor down to the first floor, and we feel that while the House is in session there is not much more we can do at this point, but we feel it is adequate at this time.

Mr. YOUNG. How would you assess the effectiveness of the security procedures prior to the bomb incident?

Mr. RUSS. We want an open society, an open Capitol. Approximately 25 million people a year are coming through the Capitol. It is logistically impossible to make the Capitol a fortress. So we work within the system. If you look at the overall police performance I think you will see that it is as good as we can do.

Mr. YOUNG. What new additions or modifications have been made in the security procedures since last week?

Mr. RUSS. We have plans for extensive modifications to our entire security system. This is not just from last week, and these modifications are going to be implemented as soon as the House adjourns. We have taken certain steps last week, which I cannot elaborate on in open hearing.

Mr. YOUNG. All right. The metal detectors that are in use around the Capitol, what are they designed to detect?

Mr. RUSS. Simply they are the type of detectors that you find in every major airport around the Nation. They detect metal objects, knives, guns, any type of metal.

Mr. YOUNG. Are they pretty well regulated somewhat similar to those found in airports, in which the buzzer will go off at different degrees.

Mr. RUSS. I would say that ours are calibrated weekly and that they are probably a little stronger than those at most airports.

Mr. YOUNG. Much has been said about the devices designed to detect explosives. How effective are these devices, and are there any plans to obtain some in the near future?

Mr. RUSS. There is not much on the market today that would detect an explosive device. The Architect and I have discussed several devices that would detect mass, but unfortunately they are not that readily available and they are so slow that we could not allow tourists to come in the Capitol.

Mr. YOUNG. Have the new security procedures in any way affected the public's accessibility to the Capitol or to the Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. RUSS. Not at all.

Mr. YOUNG. In the event it becomes necessary to place tighter controls on access to the Capitol, how might the present ID system be improved to aid in the efficient processing of both employees and visitors?

Mr. RUSS. Under the Architect's Office we do have a key-card system which is now under study, and it is a new system. It is pretty much state of the art. But again I cannot go into detail.

Mr. YOUNG. For many years the Congress has reviewed proposals to enclose the galleries with a protective shield. Do you consider such an option feasible, and if so would it prove detrimental to the public's perception of the Congress?

Mr. RUSS. I think it is not only feasible but I think we should proceed in that fashion. Some of the State legislatures have a protective shield and they are quite satisfied with it.

Mr. YOUNG. I did not realize that. Mr. Shaw indicated that Florida does. I was in the Missouri General Assembly for 20 years, and we had very limited protection. Following up on the Plexiglas maybe being installed in the House and Senate, I for one am quite concerned that the public will feel we are isolating ourselves from our constituents. Could you comment on the level of surveillance provided when the President of the United States addresses the Congress as opposed to the surveillance provided for the normal workings of the Congress?

Mr. RUSS. The normal workings of the Congress, the Capitol Building is open to the public. When the President comes we close down several blocks around the Capitol and the Capitol itself to visitors. Basically that is the only difference.

I might add that when the President comes for a joint session that he has his own Secret Service protection, too.

Mr. YOUNG. I had a chance just to visit a little bit the other day in the Chambers—do you think additional surveillance equipment could be or may be installed in the House and Senate Chambers? For instance in many of the gambling casinos, employees of the casinos are monitored, and those that are playing in the casino are monitored too at the same time. Would this be a workable arrangement in the Chambers, because I believe everybody that goes into that type of facility understands that there is some sort of a monitoring while they are in that particular environment.

Mr. RUSS. Well, I think it is certainly a worthwhile study to look into. However, I think that if a terrorist is going to take the time to get into the Chamber, he has already made up his mind to attack. We might monitor him, but it certainly will not prevent him. But it is something that we should look into.

Mr. YOUNG. It just seems to me that if the public understood, and I think they have accepted the surveillance as they go through the airport because of the terrorist activity and hijacking and things like that, that there is a distinct possibility of terrorist activity, they would accept surveillance. I am sure I want that question answered for myself.

Mr. RUSS. We can get you a detailed study of it I think through the Architect's office.

Mr. YOUNG. The level of security afforded the U.S. Senate and the House is far less than is afforded at the White House. As you are well aware, the White House has a fence around it and only certain entrances will allow access to the public. Could you comment on the feasibility of installing a similar type fence at least around the Capitol whereby Members and staff could enter through certain entrances and the public would have a separate entrance? I understand at one time there was a fence around the Capitol.

36-667 O—84——2

Mr. RUSS. Indeed there was a fence around the Capitol. That is in our overall proposal to present to the House and to the Senate, to install a fence around the Capitol exactly as you said, that would allow the Members and the staff to enter through one gate and the general public to enter through another gate, but that is definitely in our proposal.

Mr. YOUNG. When you take a look at those sorts of things, you can almost see it as a fortress to some degree, and so I think we are going to have to take a real close look at increasing the security, particularly on the east side of the Capitol, because I don't think there is much access on the West Side.

Let me ask you, what type of additional security could be provided at the service entrances at the east front? For instance, how could we prevent a truck from penetrating the House and Senate members' dining room under the configuration in front of the Capitol right now?

Mr. RUSS. How could we prevent a truck from entering into the members' dining room? I can say that as with any public building that doesn't have a fence around it, it would be very difficult to prevent someone from driving a truck into any type of Federal building.

Mr. YOUNG. But I pay more attention to those entrances.

Mr. RUSS. We have, and I think that by erecting a fence, that is our ultimate recommendation. You have to understand that Members want total access, and right now, there is no way to distinguish from a cab or a car or a truck or whatever that is coming through the plaza.

They have open access right now. We would like to eliminate that.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Russ. I appreciate your comments, and I can appreciate the sensitive position that you hold at this particular time.

I would like to ask Mr. Shaw if he would like to carry on with some questioning of Mr. Russ at this particular point.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Russ, where does your responsibility end and the Capitol Hill Police responsibility begin with regard to security of both the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings?

Mr. RUSS. The Senate Sergeant at Arms and myself, along with the Architect of the Capitol make up the Police Board. We share that responsibility. The Senate Sergeant at Arms' jurisdiction is from the center of the rotunda to his side, and mine is from the center of the rotunda to the House side.

Mr. SHAW. Do you have any jurisdiction over into the House Office Buildings?

Mr. RUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. Are you in charge of security at the entrance of the House Office Buildings?

Mr. RUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. I would like to compliment you for some of the changes that you have made. I have long been critical of the fact that all the ladies who come into the House Office Buildings, as well as the Capitol, had their purses searched, no matter what size

they are, and gentlemen with a trench coat were never even looked at twice.

Obviously, much more could be hidden under a trench coat than could be stored in a lady's purse. I brought a group of schoolchildren into the Capitol this morning at 9:30, and every one of them had to open their coats as they came in the door to be examined, and that is the proper way, unfortunately, that we have to go about the security.

I compliment you for making what I consider very necessary changes.

Mr. RUSS. Thank you. I think you will realize when you come back, you will see new security measures that have been on the books for while, but we have been waiting for the proper time to implement then.

Mr. SHAW. Are there any security differences—you need not go into detail—between the House side and the Senate side?

Mr. RUSS. No, sir. We work as a unit, basically. What we do, they do, and vice versa. We meet regularly, and we make a decision for the entire Capitol complex.

Mr. SHAW. Have you examined the master plan for the Capitol and if so, do you have any suggestions or would you like to stay around later this morning, when we have a hearing on the master plan?

Mr. RUSS. I prefer to discuss that off the record.

Mr. SHAW. But you do want to address that particular issue?

Mr. RUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. I can certainly appreciate that. I have no further questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Clarke.

Mr. CLARKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We appreciate your being here, Mr. Russ. I have a couple of questions. One is, do you anticipate closing certain entrances to the Capitol? Might that be necessary?

Mr. RUSS. I would say that is a good possibility.

Mr. CLARKE. One other question is, how about protection of the air intakes of the Capitol? Is this a problem? Is this to be considered?

Mr. RUSS. Steps have already been taken sometime back to protect the air intakes of the Capitol.

Mr. CLARKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Andrews.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess one concern I have is what happened, not in the Senate side, but what happened in the House Chamber a few weeks ago. I wonder if you would comment, one, on the nature of that event, what about that made it unusual, and in particular, the type of explosives that that fanatic attempted to get into the gallery with?

In your opinion, what was the performance of the security guards in that instance, and how could things be changed to avoid that kind of situation again?

Mr. RUSS. As you know, that is a pretty sensitive matter. That case is still pending, and it would be very difficult for me to com-

ment extensively on it, but I will say that the man had a device. It was a device that could get through our detection system.

It was an explosive device. It would have caused a great deal of damage. And I would like to say at this time that the security personnel acted in such a way that it is hard to really give them their just due, because they put their life on the line for the Congress and I cannot ask any more of any individual than to protect a Member of Congress, and that is exactly what they did.

They saw a device, they responded immediately, and I think they did the best possible job that anybody could ask of any individual.

Mr. ANDREWS. What kind of devices do we need at the door to avoid someone getting through a metal detector with plastic explosives?

Mr. RUSS. I think you just answered. The door is not the place to stop someone. The place to stop them is the first floor as they come in.

Mr. SHAW. Would the gentleman yield? Would the searches that are going on today have prevented that individual from breaking security?

Mr. RUSS. Yes.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are there detection devices that would trigger some alarm if someone tried to enter the Capitol with plastic explosives that maybe a search at the door wouldn't find?

Mr. RUSS. There is a device, but it is state-of-the-art and there is no way that we could implement it with 25 million people coming through the Capitol per year.

Everyone wants an open Capitol and we are going to give them an open Capitol. To do that, there are certain limitations that are placed on the security system of the Capitol. If you want a closed Capitol, we can secure it 100 percent like the White House, but that will never come to pass.

We are working within our boundaries and we feel that under the plans that have been implemented in the spring and early summer, and that are going to be put into effect as soon as the House adjourns, we think we could have stopped him.

Unfortunately, someone acted before we could initiate our plans.

Mr. ANDREWS. What changes will be made at the doorways to the House and the Senate gallery? I understand what you are saying about the open areas and the public areas of the Capitol on the first floor, and the thousands of tourists and people that come in and out of those doors, but specifically, the entrances to the House gallery, which is certainly much more limited, and it would seem that there could be some ways to tighten that security by other additional kinds of detective devices—what kind of proposals are you making? What kind of changes have been made?

Mr. RUSS. Mr. Andrews, there is a detailed study that we have done on that. I can assure you that the security at the entranceway to the actual chambers is extensive, but I really cannot go into detail at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much.

Mr. Levitas.

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Am I correct, Mr. Chairman, in understanding that you intend to have an executive session of the committee on this subject?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir, we do, but probably not today, Mr. Levitas. But hopefully very, very soon.

Mr. LEVITAS. But it will be before the House is asked to take any action——

Mr. YOUNG. It will be as soon as we work out the schedule with Mr. Russ.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Russ, first of all, let me acknowledge the extremely difficult responsibility you have. You have responsibilities of assuring the security of the people who use the Capitol Building, not just the members and the staff, but the public and others as well on the one hand, and then you have those of us who feel very strongly that we need to keep an open Capitol as part of an open government, and we cannot go into some sort of garrison mentality which is contrary to our whole institution of democratic government.

And even references to building fences around the Capitol—I for one totally reject. If we need to have certain limited access for vehicles or something of that sort, then possibly, but just the very thought of building a fence around the Capitol of the greatest democracy in the world is, I think, a mistake.

Let me ask you this: Mr. Russ, how many devices or weapons have been removed from people entering the House gallery or coming through other checkpoints into the Capitol buildings within, say, the last 5 to 10 years?

Mr. RUSS. We have a detailed map of the Capitol complex and as for the 5 or 6 years, I can say to you that it averages about 75 a year.

Mr. LEVITAS. In the case of the event that occurred in the House a few weeks ago, that Mr. Andrews asked you about, I want personally to commend the people involved. I was on the floor, and I saw that incident from beginning to end. I saw that man stand up. I was in conversation with another Member, and it was almost as if time stood still and everything looked in slow motion to me. Then I saw the security people not only come and grab this individual and begin to remove him, but do so in a way that really shielded this individual and whatever it was he had from others in the gallery. It was, under the circumstances, not only a very efficient action on their part, but one of great bravery for which all of us, I think, should express our appreciation.

I wish you would pass that on.

Mr. RUSS. We have, and I can't say enough for those officers.

Mr. LEVITAS. It was incredible to me. I thought the fellow had come out of the visiting troupe of "Fiddler on the Roof." I didn't know what was going on, and then, all of a sudden, I saw those security people come and grab the fellow but not just grab him, try to immobilize him from doing what might have otherwise activated that device.

One of the things that concerns me, Mr. Russ, is the same thing that bothers me about some of the Secret Service activities. They go through a lot of Mickey Mouse harassment of people, but overlook the big opportunity for something to happen.

Take what happened in Augusta recently. All sorts of security-keeping people far away, but leaving unguarded a gate through which a pickup truck could drive. Are you focusing on realistic methods of security, or are we just going to see some more harassment?

Mr. RUSS. No, sir. If you look at what happened in the past, after the 1971 bombing, we went through a 2- or 3-week period where security was extremely tight, and we went back to our old system somewhat.

This is what we are trying to do, in the spring and the early summer, we are trying to make commonsense changes, ones that will satisfy the needs of the Members who want to have an open Capitol, open office buildings, and yet the needs of security met as well. We have to protect you.

I think we are making some commonsense security proposals that every Member can be satisfied with.

And it is something that has been needed to be done, and we have been doing it. I would say about the fence, that the fence was around the Capitol. They took the fence down and we would like to see another fence put up. But it depends on the Members of Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVITAS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Russ, could you give us some historical perspective, when was a fence erected around the Capitol, when was the fence taken down?

Mr. YOUNG. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Russ, I don't mean to break in, but maybe the Architect—I saw some renditions.

Mr. WHITE. I am not precisely sure when the fence was installed. Quite early, in the early 1800's. It was removed in the 1870's, approximately. We have a photograph of it, for example, taken in 1865 or so. It was removed in conjunction with the redesign of the Capitol Grounds carried out by Olmstead in the 1880's that was completed in 1892.

The fence was not around the entire square, as we think of it today. It came quite close to the Capitol north and south, and apparently did surround the Grounds down across what is now First Street, west.

You may recall there was a railroad station down there in the Mall, what is now a nice, open area actually had a railroad station in it, and there were gates at the lower end of the Capitol Grounds at that period, with gatehouses and guards.

Apparently there was a desire at that time to restrict. The philosophy has changed over the years, and shortly thereafter, once the railroad moved away to what is now the Union Station and the tunnel built under First Street, east, to provide for the railroad crossing to the south, the fence and the grounds were all redesigned and the fence removed at that time.

As a matter of fact, one of the stone—I will call it posts—that formed a part of the fence arrangement is still in existence on Constitution Avenue, and I believe it is at 7th Street—there is an isolated post at the corner there which was one of the original posts at the Capitol.

Mr. ANDREWS. Was the fence primarily for security reasons or was it for esthetic reasons?

Mr. WHITE. I suspect it was for security reasons, since there were gates and guardhouses. It was a tall fence. It was not the sort of thing you would see in front of a house that might be partially for security. A fence is always for security in some way, even around a house.

It may be security against dogs coming into the yard, but it does keep people out, and I suspect it was for that reason rather than esthetics alone that it was installed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Russ, under the setup we have today with full vehicular access in front of the Capitol, regardless of what measures might be taken inside the Capitol, I gather that any terrorist, fanatic, or suicidal individual could drive into the Capitol area with some sort of car bomb and explode it next to or near the Capitol and create a great deal of damage and injury and almost nothing could be done to prevent that under the present situation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSS. That is correct.

Mr. LEVITAS. The fact that we would have to attempt to reduce that possibility, because I doubt that we could ever eliminate risk altogether in this regard. We would end up having to balance some risks. In denying full vehicular access into the Capitol Grounds in front of the Capitol, would it be necessary to erect a fence around the entire Grounds or just have checkpoints at the road approaches into the Capitol Plaza?

Mr. RUSS. I think you have to understand the way the terrorists operate. Most of them have their funerals days in advance of an operation, and I don't think a mere checkpoint is going to stop them.

I think if they are intent on coming into the Capitol, that it would take a barrier of some sort to physically stop them, not a police officer.

Mr. LEVITAS. I think that is a very good point, that just having a checkpoint is not going to deter the person who is suicidally bent on driving a car bomb into the Capitol Grounds. Not only that, but many car bomb setups are not of the sort we have seen in Beirut and Tyre recently, but are loaded with explosives and then ignited from a distance by some sort of radio signal.

Mr. RUSS. We intend to go into detail about that in executive session. Where they can do it.

Mr. LEVITAS. And when we get into that, the questions that we will have about how you can avoid that, even if you have a fence bringing cars in, parking them in that area, unless you dismantle each car, you may not have any opportunity of knowing what that car is loaded with, is that correct?

Mr. RUSS. That is right, yes.

Mr. LEVITAS. One last question. In response to Mr. Young's inquiry about any different security in connection with the President's visits in general, I think you mentioned Secret Service, and there was one other.

Mr. RUSS. We close the building down.

Mr. LEVITAS. You closed the building down?

Mr. RUSS. Yes.

Mr. LEVITAS. In fact, we clear out the building?

Mr. RUSS. Clear out the building, close it down.

Mr. LEVITAS. Bring in dogs to sniff around, is that done?

Mr. RUSS. Yes.

Mr. LEVITAS. And then when people are readmitted, it is under a relatively careful pass-type approach?

Mr. RUSS. Similar to the system we are using now. The perimeter is moved to the Rayburn Building. When you come for a joint session, you will notice police officers at the barricades for the subways. Now, we have them there 24 hours a day. It is similar, but it is always tight when the President comes up here.

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you.

I have more questions which will be addressed during the executive session. Let me say this: That I think we have to recognize the risks involved, and we need to take reasonable steps to minimize those risks.

But if the tradeoff comes between creating either a real closed government or the perception of a government shut off from its people, then I think we need to err on the side of assuming the risks and letting the public feel that they have access and not let a handful of fanatics change our system of government in this fashion.

I know that is not an easy assignment. And I know you are aware of the problems involved, and I feel confident that given your experience here, and your approach to this, that we may be able to resolve this in a balanced way which will come down on the side of an open government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Mr. Levitas.

Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. I have one further question which I will direct to Mr. Russ. Perhaps I should hold the question until the end of the entire panel.

When looking at the master plan for the Capitol, one thing jumped out at me, and that is why are we leaving Constitution and Independence Avenue exactly where they are? That in itself, the tremendous amount of traffic that far from the Capitol contributes to the security problems of the Capitol, and also it provides a hostile atmosphere with traffic running back and forth in what could be an expansion of the park.

By taking those two roads and bending them around to the back of the Senate Office Buildings and the House Office Buildings could provide a substantial improvement both in the development of the master plan and also in the security.

Would any of you gentlemen care to comment on that?

Mr. RUSS. I think Mr. White should comment on that.

Mr. WHITE. A consideration was given, as you are well aware, the master plan concerns itself with the whole transportation question in and around the Capitol. Those are major traffic arteries that, as you say, are arteries that are not necessarily associated with the Capitol.

They are traffic arteries for the city in general. There was a proposal made at one time which would accomplish, I think, what you

are suggesting, and that was to put them underground at the base of the Hill, and have them come up at Third or Fourth Street, east, so that the traffic as it passed through the Capitol area was not on the surface.

It was a very costly thing to do, as you can well imagine, and consideration was given to that. It was not recommended from the traffic standpoint, security as such was not a vital consideration at that time, and it may be that it should be reexamined in light of these concerns.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Russ, now that you have the microphone very generously returned to you, would you care to comment on that?

Mr. RUSS. I would certainly like to see those two arteries closed off. If they could be moved around the complex, I am for it 100 percent. I just don't know the feasibility of it. It would be a mammoth undertaking and hopefully, one day, we can get around to it.

Mr. SHAW. My suggestion was that they go to the back of the buildings rather than underground. I think symbolically having an underground road next to the Capitol may not be what we want to do.

Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Levitas.

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Russ, are the Capitol Police and other security personnel receiving any new or special training in dealing with terrorist activities, explosives and the like?

Mr. RUSS. Extensive.

Mr. LEVITAS. Are you getting a lot of cooperation from some of the other security, police, and military forces that we have at our disposal?

Mr. RUSS. 100 percent.

Mr. LEVITAS. I think you may have answered this question—are you running into any reluctance on the part of some of these organizations and agencies sharing with you either information or knowhow?

Mr. RUSS. Not at all. I can't say enough about the Secret Service or the FBI. They are backing us 100 percent all the way, and they have always been the first on the spot with any information that they might have.

Mr. LEVITAS. Well, I am very pleased to hear that. As we progress down the line and begin to evaluate some of the specific proposals, I just urge you to keep in mind that we cannot afford to establish a garrison government in this country, and even if it means taking some risks, we have just got to be aware that we are taking them.

It is not like the Marine headquarters, which doesn't have to be open to the public and shouldn't be open to the public. This is a government. It must be open to the public, for we can't have a garrison government.

Mr. RUSS. We are aware of your concern. Most of the countries in the world that have had bombings in the past have extensive measures. You don't visit the Knesset unless you are physically searched in a bomb-proof room prior to entry.

In Japan, you don't just walk into their government complex. You are screened. In most of the countries in the world, you are screened.

This is one of the few that still has an open society and we are aware of your concerns.

Mr. LEVITAS. I know you are, Jack. Even the House of Commons, the Parliament at Westminster, has less access to the public than we do here in Washington in our Capitol, and it is only in those governments where probably people don't care very much about what happens one way or the other, unlike as you have given Israel, and Japan, that it might make some difference.

I recognize that. But I think, as in so many cases, there is a risk and a price attached to certain liberties, and I don't want to see us move into a garrison mentality or a garrison government, as we take reasonable precautionary steps.

Mr. RUSS. I don't think we will, and I don't think you will ever be concerned about that.

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Any other members?

As you know, there have been additional bomb threats since the activity over in the Senate last week, and I am sure that you are doing everything you possibly can.

Mr. Russ and Mr. White and Chief Trollinger, I think Mr. Russ has probably answered a lot of the questions that the committee had at this particular point, and as we have indicated, we are going to try our best to have an executive session very, very shortly with all of you. But Chief, would you care to comment at all at this particular time, or would you rather hold your fire until we get a chance to meet again.

Mr. TROLLINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I really don't have anything that I could add to what has been said already.

Mr. LEVITAS. I have got a question for the Chief.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Levitas.

Mr. LEVITAS. Do you have adequate detention facilities for people you apprehend in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds?

Mr. TROLLINGER. We utilize the facilities of the Metropolitan Police. We transport people to their facilities, and then they become part of the system for the whole city.

Mr. LEVITAS. For example, the individual who was apprehended in the gallery recently, wasn't he taken to a detention area in the Capitol before he was returned over to the Metropolitan Police?

Mr. TROLLINGER. Yes, he was, to an office area we have in the Capitol.

Mr. LEVITAS. I have seen that office area. The reason I ask the question is that it doesn't look to me like an adequate detention facility. In fact, I recall there were some items that you have to take out of that room before you lock the person in the room.

What is your comment, Jack?

Mr. RUSS. I can say that it is not adequate, and that we are looking at rooms now that would be adequate, but they would take modification and these modifications take approval from commit-

tees and these rooms belong to other people, and so, it is not just picking out a room.

This has been under study for a long time, and it just takes a lot of time to act on just getting a room. As you are well aware, every room belongs to somebody.

Mr. LEVITAS. Well, I think that is something you really ought to focus on.

Mr. RUSS. We are.

Mr. LEVITAS. I think we do need a facility. I know the Architect of the Capitol has a little handout sheet about the jail in the Capitol, or the old jail in the Capitol, and things like that. On a lighter note, I remember this committee, the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, was considering a contempt action against certain executive branch officials.

One of the options we looked at was the inherent contempt rights of the Congress, but if you do that, you have to lock them up someplace. The only place we could find was that office that I asked you about earlier, and we didn't think that was an adequate facility if we wanted to pursue that course of action.

Mr. RUSS. Because of your interest is why we have been looking for a room, because you brought that to our attention a while back.

Mr. LEVITAS. There have been other scares and things like that since the Senate explosion. Have there been any other events which were beyond the scare or report stage that you have investigated since the Senate incident?

Mr. TROLLINGER. I am not sure I understand your question. Are you asking have we received any other——

Mr. LEVITAS. No, I know you have received reports or scares or what have you that explosives were planted.

Mr. TROLLINGER. That is right.

Mr. LEVITAS. Have you found any evidence that there were attempts, actual attempts made or preparations made?

Mr. TROLLINGER. No.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the gentleman yield, because I had a similar-type question and maybe, in your response, in this regard, how do you determine if a threat is real or not, and do you respond to each of these potential threats. And how do you do that?

Is that all right, Elliott?

Mr. LEVITAS. That would be fine.

And specifically, there was one that I heard of that went beyond just the phone call of the report involving a vehicle.

Mr. TROLLINGER. That is correct. When we receive information, a telephone call, we have standard procedures that we implement throughout the whole complex, and it is a physical search. If that search would locate a device about which we have concern, then we go into the next stage, and that next stage would depend on where this device is.

In the case of that vehicle that you are alluding to, it was on the street. The dogs reacted positively to it, so we had reason to believe that there might be something that we should investigate there.

The vehicle was—attempts were made to identify the owner and so forth. It had been on the street for 48 hours, I believe. The owner couldn't be located and so forth, so it was opened by our emergency ordnance disposal personnel and it turned out that the

item to which the dogs reacted was not a device, but to them it had the same odor and they did react, so we opened it to find out.

Mr. LEVITAS. And it turned out not to be a device or explosive?

Mr. TROLLINGER. No.

Mr. LEVITAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. TROLLINGER. The vehicle did contain a flammable material, but it wasn't in an explosive chain or anything like that.

Mr. LEVITAS. It wasn't a flammable material that was placed or located or contrived to be an explosive however; is that correct?

Mr. TROLLINGER. No. It was nothing that was unusual to be in a car.

Mr. LEVITAS. Did you ever locate the owner?

Mr. TROLLINGER. To tell you the truth, I don't know. We hauled the car to a lot, and I haven't had time since then to find out what happened to it.

Mr. LEVITAS. That is an example of the problem I was raising before. The situation and where that particular vehicle was located, had it been a car that was a car bomb and loaded with explosives, it could have done tremendous damage and caused a great deal of injury, it seems to me, because of its particular location.

Mr. TROLLINGER. That is right.

Mr. LEVITAS. And it was there for 48 hours. It doesn't have to be there that long at all. I am just not sure we are ever going to be able to devise a system that is foolproof and failsafe and that can avoid all of that type of risk involved. All we can do is take reasonable precautions to minimize foolish risks, and beyond that, we have got to accept the fact that there are crazy people in this world, and there are vicious people in this world, and we have to deal with them as best we can, but not let them prevail.

Mr. TROLLINGER. That is right. You don't want them dictating to you, I don't believe.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman from Georgia, are you finished?

Mr. LEVITAS. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Russ, in your comments, you spoke about certain modifications that were going to be made to the inside of the Chambers during the break, and you made reference to other possible changes that might be made.

What is the procedure that we go through in approving these changes? Is that done with just House administration?

Mr. RUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. I assume that you have the necessary authority to go forward with these modifications?

Mr. RUSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG. I have a question for the Chief. The security measures in the garage have been improved—I don't think there is any question about that. Do you feel the installation of a card system would be feasible in the garages, in order to avoid people trying to enter who really aren't authorized?

Mr. TROLLINGER. Well, there is no doubt that that could improve the security. However, in 1971, after the bombing of the Capitol, we instituted a close search and screening of the people who were coming into the garages, and we started this at 7 in the morning,

as I recall, and we were amazed at the volume of people who come to work at that hour, and we were causing such traffic jams on the streets that we pulled back from that right away.

Mr. YOUNG. I imagine you heard from the legislature by about 8 o'clock.

Mr. TROLLINGER. We did receive a few calls. It could be done if the system could be developed to do this speedily—then it would be a great improvement, but right now the problem is the time it takes to drive up, insert a card and wait for the gate to open or whatever device you use.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much, Chief. I understand that there is some material that has been distributed just in the last few minutes. I am not sure what pictures are out there, but I guess—I asked Mr. White's office yesterday for some sort of a rendition of what the fencing might look like around the whole complex. I have not had a chance to go through the whole thing, but I notice there are some things back in 1874 and some of the gates as far back, the west entrance, 1865. So I will ask all three of you, do you have anything else you would like to submit? I think now that the members have had a chance to look at this rendition. Is there any other material at this time you might want to submit relative to anything that we have been talking about this morning?

Mr. RUSS. I do not have anything additional that I would like to submit. I think Mr. White—this is a rendition of what the new fence would look like. It is a rough drawing. It is available if you want to look at it.

Mr. YOUNG. Do any members of the committee have any questions of Mr. White?

Mr. Clarke.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. White, thank you for these drawings.

How high do you anticipate the fence to be?

Mr. WHITE. This is of course just being looked at and I would guess 10 feet is the normal height that you think of for a security fence. I think the White House fence is 10 feet, for example. There used to be surveillance in addition to that, I believe there still is at the White House. We would probably need to do the same thing. The fence is useful, but somebody then needs to watch the fence.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you, Mr. Clarke.

Any other questions of the panel?

Well, gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for your appearance this morning and for the obvious good job that you are all doing. I know it is very difficult under the circumstances of a democracy to protect every person in this country, but I think that—I am real pleased with the testimony that you have been able to give us this morning and then waiting for the final investigation to be finished by the FBI and the Secret Service I think will be important to this committee. So on behalf of the committee, Mr. Russ, Chief Trollinger, and George White, I want to thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

MASTER PLAN FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL GROUNDS AND RELATED AREAS

We will now proceed to discuss H.R. 4332, a bill to approve the master plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and related areas.

[The text of H.R. 4332 inserts as follows:]

I

98TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4332

To approve the master plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and related areas, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 8, 1983

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. HOWARD) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation

---

# A BILL

To approve the master plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and related areas, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Capitol Grounds Master Plan Act".

SEC. 2. Congress approves the master plan entitled the "Master Plan for the Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas", dated 1981, and transmitted by the Architect of the Capitol under title V of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1976 (Public Law 94–59) (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "master plan").

Such approval is not an authorization for appropriation of funds to carry out the master plan or any part thereof.

SEC. 3. To promote and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the people of the District of Columbia and the Nation in a manner consistent with the goals of the master plan and in accordance with this Act, there is hereby established the Capitol Interest District. The Capitol Interest District consists of the following:

(1) That part of the Capitol Hill Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places on the date of the enactment of this Act, which is located between the western boundary of the historic district and the western curb of Sixth Street Northeast and Southeast.

(2) That part of the Urban Renewal District Southwest, District of Columbia, located within squares 641 and 640 south.

SEC. 4. The second sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital", approved May 16, 1930 (46 Stat. 366; 40 U.S.C. 121), is amended by striking out "any portion of which is to front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol," and inserting in lieu thereof "which is within the Capitol Interest District or any portion of which is to

front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol, the Capitol Interest District,".

SEC. 5. The first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts", approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371; 40 U.S.C. 104), is amended by inserting "(1)" before "seven well-qualified judges" and by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ", and (2) ex officio, the Architect of the Capitol for the purpose of such commission considering any design review matter arising in or bearing on the Capitol Interest District or any other property fronting or abutting on properties under the control and jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol.".

SEC. 6. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to (1) request that authority be provided under the laws of the District of Columbia for the Architect to serve as an additional member of the Historic Preservation Review Board established under section 4 of the Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978 of the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 5–1003, 1981 ed.) when the Board considers any matter arising in or bearing on the Capitol Interest District, and (2) if such authority is provided, to serve as such additional member.

SEC. 7. (a) With respect to the property described in subsection (b) of this section, the Architect of the Capitol

shall, on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, have such jurisdiction and control over such property as the Architect may, by regulation, determine necessary to enable the Architect to carry out the provisions of the master plan which the Architect determines are essential to assure the continuous preservation or improvement of the general historical character of private property which fronts or abuts upon the United States Capitol Grounds. For all other purposes, the property described in subsection (b) of this section shall remain under the control and jurisdiction of the Government of the District of Columbia.

(b) The property referred to in subsection (a) of this section is that public property which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is under the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia and is located between the eastern or southern curb line (as the case may be) of, and the property lines of lots fronting or abutting on any of, the following streets:

(1) Second Street Northeast and Southeast between F Street Northeast and C Street Southeast;

(2) C Street Southeast between Second Street Southeast and First Street Southeast;

(3) First Street Southeast between C Street Southeast and D Street Southeast;

(4) D Street Southeast between First Street Southeast and South Capitol Street; and

(5) South Capitol Street between D Street Southeast and E Street Southeast.

SEC. 8. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to expend funds appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1983, for the care and maintenance of the United States Capitol Grounds for the implementation of the landscape design described in the master plan on the property described in section 7(b) of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Architect of the Capitol, as a member of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia under the provisions of the Act of March 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 500; D.C. Code, sec. 5–412, 1981 ed.), is authorized, to the extent permitted by the laws of the District of Columbia and the rules of the Zoning Commission, to serve on the Board of Zoning Adjustment established by the Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 799; D.C. Code, sec. 5–424, 1981 ed.), for the purpose of the Board considering any matter arising in or bearing on the Capitol Interest District or any other property fronting or abutting on properties under the control and jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. YOUNG. I now call on Hon. George White, Architect of the Capitol.

## TESTIMONY OF HON. GEORGE WHITE, ARCHITECT, U.S. CAPITOL, ACCOMPANIED BY ELLIOTT CARROLL, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will dispense with some introductory remarks and will simply proceed with this slide show, which explains it in a brief fashion.

Mr. YOUNG. Without objection.

Mr. WHITE. My executive assistant, Elliott Carroll, will go through the slide show, and I will be at the screen to point the things out that he refers to.

Mr. CARROLL. In 1976 Congress authorized the Architect of the Capitol to prepare a new master plan for the future development of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and related ideas.

The Capitol Grounds, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, presently include the U.S. Capitol Building, the House and Senate Office Buildings, the Supreme Court, Library of Congress Buildings, the U.S. Botanic Garden, and the Capitol Power Plant.

Presently the grounds contain approximately 250 acres, on which are 16 primary buildings providing a combined total of approximately 11 million square feet of space.

### THE MASTER PLAN FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL

It illustrates the combined recommendations for the future development of the Capitol Grounds. Included are recommended locations for future office buildings, if they should be needed; landscape recommendations; transportation; and development program and phasing recommendations. Each of these elements is described later in this presentation.

The master plan is the result of three successive planning phases, which are documented in two earlier reports. The phase I report described the existing conditions of the Capitol Grounds and outlined the work program for the successive planning phases.

The phase II report contained an inventory of data, and the presentation and analysis of design alternatives.

The data inventory included:

First, a detailed space-use inventory of every building on the Capitol Grounds and an analysis of how the space is presently used.

Second, it included the collection and analysis of employment data for the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Library of Congress from 1980 to the present.

Third, it included a count of the numbers of visitors—both tourist and business, and an inventory of traffic volumes and street capacities as well as an analysis of the parking and commuting habits of the employees of Capitol Hill.

Fourth, it included an inventory of the historic buildings and districts both within the present area of the grounds and in the surrounding neighborhood, and a study of all past plans affecting the Capitol, beginning with the L'Enfant plan of 1792 for the city of Washington.

What is the master plan and why a new plan study?

The master plan is a response to changing conditions. The L'Enfant plan of 1972, shown here, and the McMillan plan of 1902 shown in this slide have formed a strong, imageable framework that has guided development of the city. As you can see, the McMillan plan originally called for buildings all around Capitol Square. That plan was later modified to provide for the uninterrupted open space that now extends from Constitution Avenue to Union Station. Although the McMillan plan has been followed since 1902, development on Capitol Hill has reached the limit of the proposals in that plan.

The master plan is a response to present problems:

The Longworth House Office Building is representative of the space use problem. Offices are seriously overcrowded, resulting in inefficiency and lowered productivity.

Facilities for visitors, both tourist and business, are inadequate. The Capitol receives approximately 4 million visitors a year, and there are few facilities for their use.

The Supreme Court has outgrown the facilities of its present building, which was completed in 1935. The administrative offices of the U.S. Courts could no longer be located in the building, and are scattered in several rented locations in the city, making it difficult for the Chief Justice to administer.

Traffic and parking problems impact not only the Capitol Grounds, but the surrounding community as well. Parking in the east plaza is an inappropriate foreground for our most important national symbol. The search for parking spaces here and elsewhere on the Capitol Grounds causes a spillover of parking into nearby streets and exacerbates parking problems for commercial and residential users.

South of the House Office Buildings visual and functional problems include buildings that are both visually incompatible with the congressional environment as well as inefficient for office use, and unattractive areas of deficient landscape and surface parking lots.

The planning process, of which the master plan is the result, has been an open one, in which all of the constituencies affected by Congress have been kept informed of the progress of the plan throughout its development.

The most important constituency is, of course, the 539 Members of Congress and their employees, of which there are approximately 18,000 now on Capitol Hill.

The neighborhood surrounding the Capitol is concerned with congressional activities and policies which will affect their property. The advisory neighborhood commissions of the District of Columbia, which represent the citizens, have been consulted, as have many other community organizations.

Other, broader constituencies that have been involved include the National Capital Planning Commission; the District of Columbia Office of Planning and Development; the Washington Council of Governments; and the Fine Arts Commission.

The congressional leadership and a National Advisory Group composed of individuals with a broad spectrum of knowledge have, in a sense, represented the Nation at large. The latter group was formed by the Architect of the Capitol expressly to review the

master plan and provide the broadest possible perspective on its direction.

The master plan does not say when or even if the Congress, the Supreme Court, or the Library of Congress will need new buildings. Only the Congress can make that decision. However, the plan should, and does say, as the McMillan plan did, that "if new buildings are needed in the foreseeable future, here is where they should be."

The master plan for the U.S. Capitol is based on a set of fundamental principles that have been adopted as guidelines of the plan. They are the result of considerations of the existing visual, functional, historic, and environmental contexts within which future development can occur.

First, future development should show deference to the historic heritage of the Capitol and Capitol Grounds. The Capitol and the Olmsted landscape, and several other buildings are all on the National Register of Historic Places.

Second, future development should accommodate the functional requirements of the Congress and the unique nature of the legislative process. Face-to-face interactions are central to the philosophy of the U.S. representative form of government, hence proximity of Members and committees to the Chambers must be accommodated by the plan.

Third, future movement, access, and parking requirements of Congress should to the extent possible encourage use of mass transit rather than private automobiles, and accommodate remaining cars underground within the Capitol Grounds or at peripheral sites rather than in adjoining residential areas.

Fourth, future development should represent the integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District located east of the Capitol Grounds. It is included in the National Register of Historic Places. It is deemed to be a visual and functional asset to the Capitol precinct and to the city. Measures should be taken to insure its continuance as a predominantly residential area and to define a unified physical treatment for the edge between the Capitol and the private residences.

Fifth, future development should express the natural form of Capitol Hill. The goal is to reveal the natural slope of the Hill by the physical organization and design of new buildings, spaces, and landscaping.

Sixth, existing open spaces should be preserved and enhanced. The landscaped open spaces of the Capitol Grounds give identity to the Capitol precinct; they are important features of monumental Washington.

Seventh, future development should build on and enlarge the esthetic and symbolic relationship of the Capitol Grounds to the city, the region, and the Nation. Development plans must therefore be considered in the light of their impacts both within and outside of the Capitol precinct.

Eighth, the form of future development should extend and enhance the physical fabric of the ideas in both the L'Enfant and McMillan plans.

Ninth, there is an environmental capacity that can be established for humane development of the Capitol Grounds. If Congress

should need to grow beyond that capacity, satellite locations should be chosen appropriate to those needs.

Shown is the master plan, illustrating the recommended building locations and landscape treatments just described.

It illustrates the master plan in the context of the other plans for the monumental area, the Pennsylvania Avenue plan, and the plan for the Mall. Where the west side of the Capitol Grounds intersect the other planned areas, the master plan includes the current plans for those blocks.

This sketch illustrates the same area, showing the master plan in the context of the eastern end of the Mall.

We also show in more detail the specific recommendations of the master plan for each of its component parts. The first of these is the U.S. Capitol and Capitol Square.

The Capitol is the major focus of activity on Capitol Hill; it is the center of our representative democracy and also serves as a major national museum.

The intensive use of the Capitol and the need to provide facilities for both the Congress and visitors results in heavy use of existing space in the building. In addition, the present use of the east plaza for parking and service functions, as you can see in this photograph, conflicts with the need for pedestrian access to the Capitol.

Development of space beneath the paved area of the east plaza is therefore recommended in order to provide underground parking. This would also enable the creation of a place to relocate goods delivery and trash collection activities that now occur on the surface of the east plaza.

The plan confines underground construction to the paved area of the east plaza, and will therefore not require the removal or disturbance of existing trees. Parking would be provided for approximately 500 cars in a three-level garage.

This shows the lowest of the three levels of the structure. It contains parking areas, automobile and taxi dropoffs, truck loading and unloading areas, and substantial service or storage space. The auto and truck entrance and exit tunnels continue north and south following the alignment of the existing driveways around the Capitol, and emerge inconspicuously further down the sides of Capitol Hill. The second level also contains parking, and the third, or level closest to the surface, contains space suitable for support or office uses in addition to parking.

The removal of existing parking from the east plaza and redesign of this space as a major pedestrian and ceremonial place appropriate for the main entrance to the Capitol is recommended. Through-traffic across the plaza, except for ceremonial occasions, would not be permitted. However, cul-de-sacs defined by bollards set in the pavement would provide for continued auto and taxi dropoffs at the House and Senate covered driveways.

In keeping with the original Olmsted plan, it is recommended that the present configuration of walkways and sidewalks in the plaza be retained, but that the existing asphalt surface be repaved with Belgian block.

The second area described in the plan is the north sector, or Senate side of the Capitol Grounds.

A major objective of the master plan in this area is the enhancement of existing facilities and the elimination of areas presently characterized by physical and visual disorganization. The Columbus Circle area and the area north of the existing Senate office buildings are two important areas in need of improvement.

Although the landscape of the majority of the north Capitol Grounds is in good condition, surface parking and lack of a cohesive concept detract from its overall appearance.

Although the known space needs of the Senate have been accommodated in the new Hart Senate Office Building, consideration has been given in the master plan to the location for possible future office buildings if they should be needed.

Future possible buildings indicated for this side of the Capitol Grounds include an office structure on the block east of Station, and two office buildings on the blocks north of the Russell, Dirksen, and Hart Buildings.

The building east of Union Station is recommended to visually balance the existing Post Office Building to the west and to give further definition to the whole of Columbus Circle by "finishing" its perimeter.

The two possible Senate office buildings are organized about a gateway centered on First Street, NE, forming a "gateway" to the Senate buildings from Union Station.

The buildings surrounding the plaza are to be lower and smaller in size than the Russell and Dirksen/Hart Buildings, in response to the scale of buildings they will face along Second Street and to the diminished need for space that is presumed. The buildings would be designed to face the street with short facades surrounded by courtyards and open space, as shown in this ground-floor plan of the future buildings.

Embodying the intention of creating a more humane working environment, the plaza about which these buildings are to be organized is designed to be a welcoming and lively space.

The south sector or House side of the Capitol Hill is the least "finished" area and includes a complex intermingling of public and private interests. In addition, it is the least attractive area of the Capitol Grounds, and in need of visual improvement.

The recommendations of the master plan for this sector as shown in this plan are intended to provide a balanced solution; one which responds to the potential office needs of the House of Representatives, but which also preserves and enhances the portion of the historic district along New Jersey Avenue, restores the gradual profile of Capitol Hill, and provides a coherent introduction to the monumental area from South Capitol Street.

New office buildings, here shown by the tone in a ground-level plan, are proposed to be organized about upper and lower squares centered on the axis of South Capitol Street.

Approaching from South Capitol Street one will first pass through a new arched underpass beneath the railroad and expressway bridges into a landscaped vestibule space. To the north of this vestibule are two linear future office buildings along E Street which establish the southern limit of the development and form an entrance to the monumental area.

Upon passing through this entrance, one enters a large open square richly landscaped with informal plantings. As shown in the model, the east side of this square is bordered by low office buildings and terraces. On the northwest the square opens toward the Mall, connecting South Capitol Street with Canal Street.

The existing railroad bridge spanning South Capitol Street connecting to the rail tunnel beneath First Street is to be left in its present location until such time as a less obtrusive connection between Union Station and the southern rail corridor is developed.

North of this large square begins a group of office buildings which are centered about an upper square or plaza.

As is shown in this sketch, the building heights are arranged to decrease as the buildings step down the Hill; no building will surpass the height of the attic cornice line on the Rayburn Building.

The upper plaza is planned to be smaller in size than the landscaped square at the intersection of Canal and South Capitol Streets. Buildings facing the plaza are to include a continuous open arcade and shops on the ground floors, and the plaza itself will be paved with brick and stone, and be enlivened by fountains in the center.

The existing houses on the west side of New Jersey Avenue between D and E Streets are presently included in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The plan for this area allows for the possibility that these houses may be preserved and adapted to office use. The office buildings planned to flank or replace the houses are to be designed to maintain a low profile.

### SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court occupies a one-block site facing Capitol Square.

The need for additional space for the Supreme Court is clearly demonstrated by the expansion of its activities.

To accommodate the Court's immediate space needs, it is recommended that the existing buildings of the Methodist Christian Board of Social Concerns and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, located on First Street between Maryland and Constitution Avenue, northeast, be acquired.

Together, these buildings will provide approximately 125,000 gross square feet for court use.

In addition, it is proposed that the building recommended to be located east of Union Station, as shown in this plan be used to house the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. This location is easily accessible to the Supreme Court and within a short walk of Union Station and Metro.

In conjunction with the acquisition of the Methodist and Reserve Officers Buildings, it is recommended that Maryland Avenue between First and Second Streets, northeast, be closed to traffic and the street be resurfaced with special paving for pedestrian use.

In the long-range future, consideration should be given to moving the Supreme Court to a new separate Judicial Center off Capitol Hill. Should such a move occur, it is recommended that the present Supreme Court Building be used by the Library of Congress as an expansion of its facilities for scholarly research activities.

36-667 O—84——5

In this event, the Methodist and Reserve Officers Buildings should be demolished and the block on which they now sit be converted to landscaped open space as shown in the model. The Montjoy-Bayly House at 1817–22, a historic structure, as shown, is intended to be preserved.

### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Library of Congress is regarded today not only as the congressional library, but as the national library of the United States as well.

With the completion of the James Madison Memorial Building, the Library facilities on Capitol Hill, supplemented by space in satellite locations elsewhere in Washington, are judged to be adequate for the indefinite future.

In the longer range future peripheral parking, such as is proposed on the block east of Union Station, can relieve the parking shortage at the Library. Although this facility is at some distance from the Library, it can be served by shuttle buses or the proposed People Mover running beneath First Street.

### HISTORIC DISTRICT TRANSITION AREA

The eastern boundary of the master plan along Second Street, C Street Southeast, and New Jersey Avenue Southeast, is of special concern because it is the physical boundary between the public areas of the Capitol Grounds and private residential and commercial uses within the Capitol Hill Historic District.

As you can see in these photos, the buildings along the east side of Second Street are in excellent condition and follow the general style of architecture found throughout the historic district.

It is recommended in the master plan that the continuous character of the historic district along this street be preserved and protected.

In addition, it is recommended that the streetscape on both sides of the street, including sidewalks, paving, landscaping and street furniture be developed in a consistent vocabulary of design, to emphasize and enhance the special transitional nature of the street.

The sidewalks will be paved according to a single unified design. Present tree plantings will be improved where necessary.

Guidelines for colors to be used along the street are proposed, which are consistent with colors already in use on many buildings throughout the historic district.

Restoration and, where appropriate, new construction of fences and walls, along the front yards, as shown in this sketch, is proposed to be undertaken in accordance with guidelines to be established by the Architect of the Capitol and the property owners.

To achieve this unified treatment, it is proposed that the jurisdiction of all public rights of way presented owned by the District of Columbia which are contiguous to the streets on the eastern and southern boundaries of the Capitol Grounds, which are now, or later become, part of the Capitol Grounds, be transferred to the Architect of the Capitol. No acquisition of the private properties themselves is planned.

To preserve the present building character along the transition area, it is recommended that Congress adopt specific height, bulk and use limits to be made part of the District of Columbia Zoning ordinance as a "Capitol Interest District" overlay zone.

This new district, covering neighboring nonresidential zones, would restrict the list of uses permitted under existing zoning provisions and would provide supplemental controls on building bulk and height.

Its purpose is to prevent future development that would have deleterious effects on the desired ambiance of the Capitol Grounds and the residential neighborhood.

To ensure the application of design guidelines it is recommended that the Shipstead-Luce Act be amended to make the Architect of the Capitol a limited member of the Commission on Fine Arts.

As a member, the Architect would be authorized to participate in design review decisions for properties abutting the Capitol Grounds and those within the proposed overlay zoning district.

Thus, the Congress would retain the function of design review for the overlay zoning district, in conjunction with the Joint Committee on Landmarks of the District of Columbia.

## LANDSCAPE PLAN

The landscape plan element of the master plan defines the treatment for street landscaping, interior spaces, courtyards and plazas, and the restoration of, maintenance and enhancement of historic landscapes.

The landscape plan shown here in its entirety proposes to maintain the present high quality of existing landscaped areas, and to improve areas that lack appropriate landscape or have been disrupted by conversion to surface parking lots.

The landscape plan is built on five overall concepts. The first of these is that street trees should frame the landscape of interior spaces and be as nearly continuous as possible.

The second concept is that interior spaces defined in the plan be designed in an informal manner which emphasizes their interior orientation.

Although the majority of the north grounds is well landscaped, existing surface parking disrupts its overall appearance, and it lacks an overall unifying concept.

Shown in the center is the new visual axis proposed to extend from Columbus Circle to the foundation atop the Senate parking garage, and the conversion of Delaware Avenue to a pedestrian promenade.

The third concept is that courtyards and plazas be defined by special paving, and enlivened by fountains or flowering trees and shrubs as shown in this plan for the House plaza.

The fourth concept is the restoration, maintenance and enhancement of historic and presently well-maintained landscaped areas.

The Olmstead landscape of Capitol Square is on the National Register of Historic Places, and although it closely resembles the original Olmstead plan, recommendations are made to further return it to its original appearance.

On the west side of the grounds, the plan incorporates previous plans for Ceremonial Drive which is to link Canal Street and Louisiana Avenue with a promenade primarily for pedestrian use.

### TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Transportation and parking on Capitol Hill are issues that affect not only employees, but also the adjacent neighborhood, visitors and the District of Columbia as a whole.

The transportation plan includes a recommended circulation and parking plan and a plan for future rail transit.

Shown are the existing and future proposed parking locations and a street circulation system. It is recommended that, where possible, future parking be included in garages within future office buildings. The total amount of parking provided for in the plan is approximately 12,250 spaces.

This includes the removal of approximately 4,500 lot spaces, and the addition of approximately 7,500 spaces; a net gain of 3,000 spaces.

2,500 of the future spaces are included in a proposed peripheral parking garage that is shown next to Union Station. This garage could also serve as interim parking during possible construction activities that require removal of existing parking areas.

The plan recommends measures for congressional consideration which would provide incentives for employee and visitor use of mass transit rather than private automobiles, making possible an increase of 55 percent transit use from the existing 23 percent reported in the 1977 phase II report.

Thus, the 30-percent increase in spaces shown in the plan could accommodate double the number of employees, the proposed maximum possible employment for which the plan provides.

The transportation systems recommended in the master plan are shown in this illustration. The first of these is the existing House and Senate subways in the Capitol. Future House and Senate subways may be required to serve future possible office buildings.

Also illustrated is the proposed People Mover shown running between Union Station at the north and the future House Office Buildings at the south. This alignment follows the existing two-track rail tunnel beneath First Street, shown here where it emerges from the ground at New Jersey Avenue and D Street, Southeast.

A shuttle subway system would supplement the Metro system, connecting the two Metro stations on the north and south sides of the Capitol Grounds, and in addition provide service from the proposed peripheral parking garage east of Union Station to the House and Senate Office Buildings, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the Library of Congress.

Until such a major public work is authorized, a frequent surface shuttle bus could follow the same route.

### DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The development program is a description of the existing and future space that is accommodated by the master plan. This program is based on the layout of buildings shown in the plan, and as

such is the result of the urban design, architectural, and landscape recommendations of the plan.

Shown in the illustration are the possible future buildings indicated in the master plan. The development shown includes approximately 1.34 million gross square feet of future development on the Senate side, and approximately 2.8 million gross square feet of development on the House side.

Including the underground development beneath the East Plaza and the potential courtyard infill developments, the total future development shown in the master plan is approximately 4.8 million gross square feet.

Existing development now occupies approximately 9.3 million gross square feet, for a future total of 14.1 million gross square feet of development.

Based on improved space use efficiency in both existing and future buildings, as has been utilized in the Hart Senate Office Building, this development could accommodate a maximum of between 34,000 and 38,000 employees, approximately double the present number on Capitol Hill.

Since space standards and use of space may change over the course of the master plan, this number is only an expression of a possible order of magnitude; it is not a projection of future growth.

As stated at the beginning of this presentation, the master plan is neither a prescription nor a recommendation for future development. The precept followed by the master plan is that if Congress needs new buildings, here is where they should be.

The development shown in the master plan is considered to be maximum "environmental capacity" at Capitol Hill to accommodate possible growth. Future development required beyond that shown here is recommended to be accommodated in satellite locations elsewhere in Washington.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Carroll, could I interrupt for 1 minute? Mr. Shaw has to leave and has some comments.

Mr. SHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to be participating in the ERA debate that will be taken on the floor and will not come back to this particular hearing. I want to just take this opportunity to compliment the Office of the Architect for bringing this very fine plan to us.

I have some problems with it that I want to discuss with you. It is not as to the concepts or the land plan that this presents, but as to the inclusion of certain office buildings which might well be interpreted at a future day as this Congress making a pronouncement with regard to the need for such office.

As I vigorously oppose any thought or any discussion or any movement toward discussion of additional office space for either the Congress or the Senate, but I do not want my objection to be construed as being obstructive of this plan.

I think it is a marvelous plan, and I commend you for bringing it to us.

Mr. YOUNG. Please proceed, Mr. Carroll.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you. The master plan is intended to be valid over many years, perhaps 50 to 75 years, depending on future congressional needs.

The implementation of projects over such a long time period will require periodic review, complex decisions and negotiations by all participants. The first step in this process, defined in the master plan, is to establish the sequence of events that will be required if elements of the plan are implemented.

On the Senate side, the phasing sequence is relatively simple, as shown in this diagram.

The implementation of landscape recommendations for the north Capitol Grounds is, in part, dependent on the demand for parking, and congressional parking policy, because of the need to remove surface parking lots.

Implementation of these recommendations can be undertaken independent of the phasing of other projects.

There are two alternatives for the location of a possible additional House Office Building. The first of these is construction of a building shown at the upper right, to replace the existing HOBA No. 1.

If a larger first increment of space is found necessary, the first increment would be development of a building southwest of Canal Street. The second phase of development will be either one of these, whichever is not first.

The third phase of possible House development is shown south of the Longworth and Rayburn Buildings on areas most now occupied by House parking garages. The last phases of development would occur in the square near New Jersey Avenue.

Possible development under the East Plaza of the Capitol and for the Supreme Court are independent of other phasing considerations and therefore can be undertaken at any time. In the long range it is recommended that the Methodist and Reserve Officers Buildings be developed as part of the landscaped open space of the Supreme Court.

CONCLUSION

That completes the presentation of the master plan.

Although the plan itself is completed, the tenure of the master plan is just beginning. It is suggested that the next appropriate step is for the Congress to adopt the plan, thereby establishing it as the guide for possible future development of the Capitol Grounds. Because this is a dynamic process, provision should be made for periodic review by future Congresses.

Like the McMillan and L'Enfant plans before it, the master plan does not propose construction; rather it provides a design to enable any future construction that takes place to be accomplished in conformity with an approved concept.

That concept, as you have seen in this presentation, results from the sum of numerous parts: It is an urban design plan, a transportation plan, a site plan, a historic preservation plan and a sequencing plan. Taken as a whole, it is submitted as a fitting culmination of the planning process for the Capitol precinct. It yields a result

that, when brought to fruition by future detailed designs, will be of lasting beauty, to be enjoyed by future generations.

Mr. YOUNG. I am sorry, Mr. White, but I am going to have to go vote. I will be back as soon as this rollcall is finished and then we will proceed.

Mr. White, I really appreciate your presentation of the plan today.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

Mr. YOUNG. The subcommittee will come to order, please.

Mr. Robert Broshar, president of the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. Broshar, the full text of your prepared statement will appear in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

## A Statement by Robert Broshar, FAIA

Chairman Young and members of the Subcommittee, I am Robert Broshar, President of The American Institute of Architects and I am pleased to appear before you today to endorse The Master Plan for Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas. The AIA has a long involvement in the development of the Plan and a long-standing commitment to the orderly development of our nation's Capitol and the Capital City.

I would like to commend the Architect of the Capitol, George M. White for his diligence and commitment to the Master Plan and to the process which allowed this Master Plan to evolve. Special mention should also be made of the contributions of Elliott Carroll, Executive Assistant to the Architect and Project Administrator for the Master Plan. Mr. White, Mr. Carroll and their staff have devoted countless hours to the development of the Plan and to the education and involvement of various interested and affected groups. This Plan has been developed through an open and public process. The process speaks highly for the result.

Before addressing the specifics of the Master Plan itself, I would like to express the appreciation of the entire AIA membership for the strong support which emanated from this Subcommittee for the restoration of the West Front of the Capitol. Hearings chaired by Congressman Young in this Subcommittee last March got the "ball rolling" and rekindled Congressional interest in the issue. I would particularly like to single-out Congressman Shaw for his leadership on the West Front and acknowledge the key role he played throughout that debate and especially during the May 25 floor consideration. Thank you all for your critical support.

AIA Role

We now find ourselves reviewing a related matter -- the Master Plan for the Capitol and Related Areas. Let me begin by giving you a brief history of the AIA's involvement with the Master Plan so you can understand our keen interest, not only in its development but also in its adoption by the Congress.

As early as 1963 the AIA was urging Congress to develop a Master Plan and the AIA testified on a number of occasions in support of appropriations to fund the Master Plan. For a number of years the AIA had an internal Task Force review the combined issues of the West Front and the Master Plan. In 1976, the Task Force on the U.S. Capitol reviewed the Phase I Report and "commended the Architect of the Capitol, his staff, and consultants for the inauguration of a timely, multi-disciplinary and comprehensive planning process." The AIA Board of Directors in December 1976 concurred with the Task Force Report and instructed the Task Force to continue reviewing subsequent phases of the Master Plan. It should be noted at this time that the members of the Task Force possessed specific expertise in the fields of design, preservation, urban planning and the design and master planning of governmental facilities.

This same Task Force again reviewed the Phase II Report, "Toward a Master Plan," issued in August 1977. A report was issued to the AIA Board in October 1977 and a Final Report was issued to the Board in March 1978. This final Report was accepted by the Board. At this point a separate Task Force to deal only with the Master Plann was established. Between Phase II and Phase III the AIA Task Force met with the Architect of the Capitol and reviewed progress being made on Phase III and at that time reported it was "favorably impressed"

with the Plan. In August 1980 the Task Force met and determined that many of its suggestions had been incorporated into the Plan. In May 1981, the Architect of the Capitol appeared at the Board of Directors meeting held prior to the AIA National Convention in Minneapolis. At that meeting the Board of Directors endorsed the Master Plan. Since that endorsement the AIA has repeatedly made clear its commitment to the adoption of the Master Plan. Let me emphasize to the members of this Subcommittee that the AIA is 100 percent behind this Plan. This Plan is critical if we are to insure the orderly growth of our legislative branch of government. We intend to do everything possible to aid in the passage of H.R. 4332 in the House of Representatives and similar legislation in the Senate.

The Master Plan

Now I would like to turn my attention to the Master Plan itself. Planning is a living, evolving process and urban design is an art. Both planning and urban design are fraught with inherent constraints. There were many constraints facing the design team for this Plan -- questions of growth vs. no-growth, preservation vs. development, the fate of residential neighborhoods, as well as economic and transportation concerns. The Plan addressed all of these concerns and questions and offered a balanced resolution. No plan solves every problem, nor should it. Plans evolve and it is clear Congress will be the determinant of how much growth, how fast. But Congress needs this Master Plan to help it decide how to proceed and where to proceed. The capital city is dependent upon this plan. Plans allow us to step back and look at what we've done, reevaluate and move forward.

As the members of this Subcommittee well know, this Plan was not an easy document to produce. It is the result of our political system and the fact that we are at the point of adopting the Plan speaks highly of our system of government and the open system of review and input that followed Phase I, Phase II and Phase III. Understand that this Master Plan is not a design solution. Rather, it is an established framework for planning ahead.

Certain guidelines were central to the development of this Plan and these are worth mentioning briefly:

1) Future development should show deference to the historic heritage of the Capitol and Capitol Grounds.

2) Future development should accommodate the functional requirements of the Congress and the unique nature of the legislative process.

3) Future movement, access and parking requirements of Congress should, to the extent possible, be accommodated within the Capitol Grounds or at remote Congressional sites rather than in adjoining residential areas.

4) Future development should respect the integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District located east of the Capitol Grounds.

5) Future development should express the natural form and character of Capitol Hill.

6) Existing open spaces should be preserved and enhanced.

7) Future development should build on and enlarge the aesthetic and symbolic relationship of the Capitol Grounds to the city, the region and the nation.

8) The form of future development should extend and enhance the physical fabric of the ideas in both the L'Enfant and McMillan plans.

9) There is an environmental capacity that can be established for humane development of the Capitol Grounds.

The Master Plan before you today is true to these guidelines. There are no surprises in this Plan and we think it is a sound and and energetic way to proceed. The AIA is excited about intentions for the East Plaza of the Capitol, Senate Plaza, House Plaza and the extended use of pedestrian walkways. We think the proposed landscaping is excellent and will allow the soon-to-be-restored West Front to enjoy the vistas envisioned by Frederick Law Olmsted. The Proposed interfacing of the Capitol and the Historic District is especially pleasing and desirable. Many of the Plan's aspects will increase public access and make the Capitol area a more pleasant environment for the millions who visit here each year.

The recent explosion on the Senate side of the Capitol underscores how important The Capitol building and its grounds are to all of us. We think many aspects of the Plan -- especially the closing off of streets around the Capitol and proposed office buildings -- would increase the security of the Capitol itself. This Subcommittee might wish to look at particular portions of the Plan to see whether or not some of these aspects could be incorporated at once in order to enhance security.

The Master Plan document states that the Plan "...is meant to strengthen positive elements of present conditions by restoring and consolidating the existing buildings and to enhance the flexibility of new structures on the Hill by integrating them into new public squares and areas of mixed use." We think the Plan has done this and, in fact, these elements represent some of the most exciting aspects of the Plan. A balance between the existing and the new has been accomplished. Environmental protection and historic preservation considerations have been incorporated into the Plan. A spatial order and visual clarity needs to be restored to Capitol Hill and the vehicle to do this is the Master Plan. The Plan calls for more green, open spaces which will establish order, clarity and public enjoyment.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by pointing out that this city serves as an excellent example of planning. The L'Enfant Plan has had a lasting impact and affects us all in our daily movements around the Capital City. This Master Plan is the first since the McMillan Plan of 1902. Years of work went into this Master Plan; experts from various disciplines contributed in an open and thorough process. In fact, I might add very proudly, that two AIA Gold Medal winners, I.M. Pei and Romaldo Giurgola were intimately involved in this project.

I know this has been said before but I think it bears repeating -- the future development laid out in the Master Plan is to follow the precept expressed by the McMillan Plan, "If Congress needs new buildings, here is where they should

be." The Master Plan states that the building program suggested "...is not a prescription or recommendation for development." The authorizations and appropriations necessary to carry out the Master Plan are, rightly so, left to the Congress. Congress does not need to look at this Plan defensively because it proposes additional building. Only Congress will decide when and if such building should occur. Congress has always decided whether there should be expansion on Capitol Hill. This Plan proposes no deviation from this tradition.

This Master Plan can provide for Congressional space needs for 50-75 years. This Plan is not set in stone. The Plan talks of continual updating, review and evaluation. The document is susceptible to alterations and modifications. In the final analysis, it is the Congress that will decide how much and where.

The Capitol and its grounds are an international symbol of democracy and a great source of pride for our citizens. The steadily growing number of visitors to Capitol Hill attests to this. Because of this and the Constitutional importance of the legislative branch in an ever-increasingly complex and dangerous world, there must be a plan for the development of the Capitol Grounds. Our history demands nothing less. The Master Plan before you is a sound and responsible approach to the future. The American Institute of Architects encourages its speedy adoption.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time. Thank you for this opportunity to appear here today.

Mr. YOUNG. Please proceed.

## TESTIMONY OF ROBERT BROSHAR, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Mr. BROSHAR. Chairman Young, members of the subcommittee, I am Robert Broshar. I am pleased to be able to appear before you to endorse the Master Plan for Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas.

The AIA does have a long involvement in the development of the plan and a long-standing commitment to the orderly development of our Nation's Capitol and the Capital City.

I will try to summarize parts of my remarks. But I also feel it is important that we do include in our statement some of the specifics.

First, I would like to commend the Architect of the Capitol, George White, for his diligence and commitment to the master plan and to the process which allowed this master plan to evolve.

Special mention should also be made of the contributions of Elliott Carroll, the Executive Assistant to the Architect, who was the project administrator for this plan. Mr. White, Mr. Carroll and their staff, have devoted countless hours to the development of the plan and to the education and involvement of various interested and affected groups.

This plan has been developed through an open and public process and the process speaks highly for the result. Before addressing the specifics of the master plan itself, I would also like to express the appreciation of our entire membership for the strong support which emanated from this subcommittee for the restoration of the west front of the Capitol.

Hearings chaired by Congressman Young and this subcommittee last March got the ball rolling, and rekindled congressional interest in the issue. I would also like to single out Congressman Shaw for his leadership on the west front and acknowledge the key role that he played throughout the debate and especially during the May 25 floor consideration.

Thank you all for your critical support.

We now find ourselves reviewing a related matter, the master plan for the Capitol and related areas. I would like to begin by giving you a brief history of AIA's involvement with the master plan so that you can understand our keen interest, not only in its development, but also in its adoption by the Congress.

As early as 1963, the AIA was urging Congress to develop a master plan and the AIA testified on a number of occasions in support of appropriations to fund that master plan. For a number of years, the AIA had an internal task force review the combined issues of the west front and the master plan.

In 1976, the task force on the U.S. Capitol reviewed the phase I report and commended the Architect of the Capitol, his staff and consultant, for the inauguration of a timely, multidisciplinary and comprehensive planning process.

The AIA board of directors in December 1976 concurred with that task force report and instructed the task force to continue reviewing subsequent phases of the master plan. It should be noted

at this time that the members of the task force possessed specific expertise in the fields of design, preservation, urban planning, and the design and master planning of governmental facilities.

This same task force again reviewed the phase II report, which was issued in August 1977. The report was issued to our board in October 1977, and a final report was issued in March 1978.

This final report was accepted by the board and at this point a separate task force to deal only with the master plan was established.

Between phase II and phase III, the AIA task force met with the Architect of the Capitol and reviewed progress being made on phase III, and at that time reported it was favorably impressed with the plan.

In August 1980, the task force met and determined that many of the suggestions had been incorporated into the plan, and in May 1981, the Architect of the Capitol appeared at the board of directors' meeting held prior to our national convention in Minneapolis.

At that meeting, the board of directors endorsed the master plan. Since that endorsement, the AIA has repeatedly made clear its commitment to the adoption of the master plan. Let me emphasize to the members of this subcommittee that the AIA is 100 percent behind this plan.

This plan is critical if we are to ensure the orderly growth of our legislative branch of Government. We intend to do everything possible to aid in the passage of H.R. 4332, in the House of Representatives and similar legislation in the Senate.

In an attempt to summarize some of the elements of the statement, I would like to turn my attention to the master plan itself and deal with the essence of planning. Planning is a living, evolving process, and urban design is an art. Both planning and urban design are fraught with inherent constraints.

There were many constraints facing the design team for this plan. Questions of growth versus no growth, preservation versus development, the fate of residential neighborhoods as well as economic and transportation concerns.

The plan addressed all of these concerns and questions and offered a balanced resolution. No plan solves every problem, nor should it.

Plans evolve and it is clear Congress will be the determinant of how much growth and how fast. But Congress needs this master plan to help it decide how to proceed and where to proceed.

The Capital City is dependent upon this plan. Plans allow us to step back and to look at what we have done, to re-evaluate and to move forward.

As the members of this subcommittee well know, this plan was not an easy document to produce. It is the result of our political system and the fact that we are at a point of adopting the plan speaks highly of our system of government, and the open system of review and input that followed phase I, phase II, and phase III.

We understand that this master plan is not a design solution. Rather, it is an established framework for planning ahead. I do want to comment on the recent explosion on the Senate side of the Capitol, because it underscores how important the Capitol Building and is Grounds are to all of us.

We think many aspects of the plan, especially the closing off of streets around the Capitol and proposed office buildings, would increase the security of the Capitol itself. This subcommittee might wish to look at particular portions of the plan to see whether or not some of these aspects could be incorporated at once in order to enhance that security.

The master plan document states that:

> The plan is meant to strengthen positive elements of present conditions by restoring and consolidating the existing buildings and to enhance the flexibility of new structures on the Hill by integrating them into new public squares and areas of mixed use.

We think the plan has done this, and, in fact, these elements represent some of the most exciting aspects of the plan. A balance between the existing and the new has been accomplished.

Environmental protection and historic preservation considerations have been incorporated into the plan. A special order and visual clarity needs to be restored to Capitol Hill, and the vehicle to do this is the master plan.

The plan calls for more green, open spaces, which will establish order, clarity, and public enjoyment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by pointing out that this city serves as an excellent example of planning. The L'Enfant plan has had a lasting impact that affects us all in our daily movements around the Capital City.

This master plan is the first since the McMillan plan of 1902. Years of work went into this master plan. Experts from various disciplines contributed in an open and thorough process.

In fact—and I would like to add very proudly—two AIA gold medal winners, I.M. Pei and Romaldo Giurgola, were intimately involved in the project.

I know this has been said before, but I think it bears repeating. The future development laid out in the master plan is to follow the precept expressed by the McMillan plan. If Congress needs new buildings, here is where they should be. The master plan states that the building program suggested is not a prescription or a recommendation for development.

The authorization and appropriations necessary to carry out the master plan are rightly so left to the Congress. Congress does not need to look at this plan defensively, because it proposes additional buildings. Only Congress will decide when and if such building should occur.

Congress has always decided when there should be an expansion on Capitol Hill. And this plan proposes no deviation from this tradition.

This master plan can provide for congressional space needs for 50 to 75 years. The plan is not set in stone. The plan talks of continual updating, review, and evaluation.

The document is susceptible to alterations and modifications. And in the final analysis, it is the Congress which will decide how much and where.

The Capitol and its Grounds are an international symbol of democracy and a great source of pride for all of our citizens. The steadily growing number of visitors to Capitol Hill attests to this. Because of this, and the constitutional importance of the legislative

branch in an ever increasingly complex and dangerous world, there must be a plan for the development of our Capitol Grounds.

Our history demands nothing less. The master plan before you is a sound and responsible approach to the future. The American Institute of Architects encourages its speedy adoption.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time. I appreciate the opportunity to be heard today.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much for your fine statement. We appreciate the continuing interest of the American Institute of Architects.

I just have two questions, Mr. Broshar, and I think maybe you have answered a part of one, but maybe you could enlarge. As you are aware, there are some Members of Congress who have expressed concern that approval of the master plan will, in fact, be a statement by the Congress that growth on Capitol Hill is preordained. That, in fact, we support construction of the buildings referenced in the master plan, so perhaps a master plan should not contain any reference to any new buildings.

Would you care to comment on that observation?

Mr. BROSHAR. Well, as I believe is stated in the report, it is our view that the master plan is not an endorsement of the expansion of government, the expansion of government facilities. Rather, it deals with if the expansion is needed, how that expansion can be dealt with in an orderly fashion.

Other aspects of the master plan deal with specific issues that are separate from additional buildings, and they solve problems that do exist and are existent on Capitol Hill today.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the master plan the 1905 plan—similar to the McMillan plan, and in what fashion is it, if so?

Mr. BROSHAR. The McMillan plan and this plan that will be before Congress have many similarities. I think it points up the evolutionary aspect of growth and development on Capitol Hill through a planning process.

One of the significant changes reflects a change in transportation and a recognition of the very strong and central element of the Union Station. In the previous plan there were buildings that were developed along the northern section which would be to the west of the Senate office buildings.

And this plan has modified to recognize changes, changes in transportation, changes in the needs on the Hill.

I would consider the two plans as being supportive. One is just an evolution from the other plan.

Mr. YOUNG. Fine. Thank you very much for your appearance here this morning.

Mr. BROSHAR. Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG. The next witness will be Mr. Tom Alder, from the Capitol Hill Restoration Society.

Mr. Alder, the full text of your prepared statement will appear in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

## Testimony of Thomas P. Alder, Chairman, Task Force on the U.S. Capitol Master Plan

Mr. Chairman, I am Thomas P. Alder, Chairman of the Task Force on the U.S. Capitol Master Plan. The Task Force was established by the Capitol Hill Restoration Society in February of 1977 to bring the interests and perspectives of the Capitol Hill community to bear on the Master Plan development process. To this end, the Task Force, with the cooperation of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6B formed a larger and less formal body, designated the Coalition of Community Organizations on the Master Plan. This coalition, with 12 member organizations, then functioned as a broadly-based and quite active advisory group, participating at several points in the part of the planning process designated "Phase II". At the conclusion of this phase the Coalition, which I co-chaired, determined that its mission was over, allowing its role to devolve back to the Task Force. Since that time the Task Force has been the one community organization directly monitoring and participating in "Phase III" of the Master Plan development.

The Task Force represents primarily the interests of residents within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Its guiding philosophy is that a stable and carefully maintained residential quarter is the traditional and appropriate setting for the Capitol Grounds, and that we, the residents, are to a large extent the trustees of this district. We look to the Master Plan as a document of our working partnership with Congress, to preserve the transition zone and control the corrosive effects of obsolete zoning designations, excessive speculation, and commercial overdevelopment. Our contribution to the Master Plan has followed closely an April 1977 Statement of Principles which is germane to today's consideration of the Plan, and which I would like to submit for the record with the request that it appear at this point in the text of my remarks. (Exhibit 1).

Support for the Master Plan

The Task Force has supported the planning process over its six year course, and now supports the results with three specific reservations. Before exploring these we would like to commend the planners on the occasion of these hearings for the sincerity of their effort and their willingness to revise their initial assumptions about the rate of staff growth and the resulting pace of Capitol expansion. Hand in hand with this evolution has come an increased appreciation for the national value of the Capitol Hill Historic District and for the steps needed to insure its protection. These appear in the Plan as the proposals for special zoning procedures in the Capitol Interest District and the sequencing of any new construction in such a way as to delay and minimize its impact on the Historic District. These provisions, coming toward the end of the long planning effort, have made it possible for the community to have confidence in the final product.

Mr. Chairman, support for the Plan as it has evolved has been expressed in the resolutions of community organizations from time to time. Two which I would like to submit for the record at this time were adopted by the Capitol Hill Restoration Society on September 10, 1980 (Exhibit 2) and on April 14, 1982 (Exhibit 3). Both also state specific reservations about the Plan. I would like to ask that they appear at this point in the body of my testimony.

Three Changes Recommended

The Task Force wishes to recommend three distinct actions for the subcommittee's consideration. Two involve small changes to H.R. 4332 while one would entail a stipulation in the legislative history of Section 2 of the bill.

1. AOC Jurisdiction over front yards. Section 7 of the bill would give the Architect of the Capitol jurisdiction and control of the yards in front of houses and other buildings lying across the street from the Capitol Grounds. The purpose of this provision is to assist implimentation of the streetscaping elements of the Plan. We have consistently taken the position that such a sweeping step far exceeds the requirements of the task, and we have recommended that the transfer of jurisdiction extend only to the edge of the sidewalk farthest from the curb. If experience proves that implimentation is too difficult without a greater incursion, further authority could be given to the Architect after legislative hearings in which these problems could be documented and aired.

If Section 7 is amended to limit the transfer of jurisdiction as is suggested here, little will be lost in the way of design control. Alteration or new construction would still be subject to approval by both the D.C. Historic Preservation Board and the federal Commission on Fine Arts. Since H.R. 4332 contemplates that the Architect will serve on one or both of these bodies when Capitol district matters are before them, the bill itself expresses the belief that they are significant and competent agencies for design review. Beyond this, since the yard spaces are subject to D.C. jurisdiction under existing law, any need to have temporary access for streetscaping work could be achieved through and operating agreement with the city as the need arose.

If the gains sought by Section 7 as currently drafted are marginal, the drawbacks are, by contrast, quite real. First, AOC jurisdiction is to be invoked only as needed, and under "regulations" issued by the Architect. This gives the impression of the Architect's office as a new source of municipal ordinances, adding to the perception that the

foremost result of the new law will be a confusion of responsibilities between the Architect and the city. Any reduction in the level of city maintenance which flowed from this ambiguity would either increase the burden on residents to take the initiative with the city, or would draw the Architect and Congress further into the process of governing the space between the curb and the building line. It is hard to see what offsetting goals would justify the friction losses this would generate. A second problem is no less troublesome, although it has been overlooked until recently. Many residences on the surrounding streets have bays which were built out over the building line following late 19th century practice. If Section 7 conveys jurisdiction to the building line, these bays might be subject to design standards issued by the Architect above and beyond the approval required from both the local preservation agency and the federal Fine Arts Commission. The fact that such a prospect may be disavowed as unintended only serves to suggest that Section 7 now represents an oversized and redundant solution to a problem which may never occur. We strongly urge that it be amended to cover only the sidewalks.

2. An Annual Report on Implimentation. The Master Plan has been presented with the oft-stated reminder that it should be subject to periodic review over its lifespan. We think it is a significant omission that H.R.4332 has no statutory mechanism for an implimentation progress report which would help institutionalize legislative oversight into the Plan. Leaving the review process to chance is, in a real sense, inconsistent with the fundamental precepts of the Plan itself. It also gives rise to concern that the Plan will acquire a "life of its own" or that implimentation measures will stray from their original purpose. We hope the subcommittee will address this by adding a section which requires the Architect to file

an annual report on the implimentation of this legislation with the appropriate officers of both chambers. While frequency of the reporting requirement is less significant than its certainty, we would hope that it might be a biennial event at least, thereby giving each Congress a comparable basis on which to conduct oversight.

3. Remove the West Side of New Jersey Ave., S.E. from Plan. The Plan contemplates that private buildings on the west side of New Jersey Avenue in square 693 will be absorbed into the Capitol Grounds in the last phase of any future House expansion. Reflecting community opposition to the provision, the Plan leaves open the possibility that exisiting structures may be retained for office use, or even for residential use on a leased basis. While we appreciate the consideration thus far shown by the Architect and the planning group, we are constrained to disagree with the proposition that this one row of residential buildings should ever go into public ownership for office use. This position has been reinforced by study of the final plans for this square. These show that the main buildings will center on an internal plazza or great square, with the easternmost of these buildings backing up on the rear of the residential row which faces New Jersey Ave. In the overall design of this outer edge of the Capitol Grounds, the New Jersey Ave. row is a physical outsider, relating to the residential row across the street (which is not in the Plan) rather than the larger buildings behind it. It appears in the Plan as an improvised and anomalous filament. It will be expensive to acquire, and will yield relatively little in efficient space.

The Task Force and other community organizations have for years recommended that the fully-developed residential row on the west side of New Jersey Ave. be excluded from the Plan to clarify its permanent

status. This has always been seen as an important factor in stabilizing the character, use, and level of maintenance which this important row will receive during the next 50-75 years. Recent pressures on these structures and their zoning only confirms that this is a legitimate concern. Although we are reluctant to recommend any major excision of the Plan in the initial adopting legislation, we strongly believe that a failure to express an intent to except this row in a legislative annotation to Section 2 of the bill will have early consequences. These include possible zoning changes and a reduction in commitments of private capital to improvement and long-term maintenance. For your reference, an earlier resolution on this issue is included at Section 3 of the Restoration Society resolution of September 10, 1980, referred to earlier.

While there is disagreement between the community and the Plan over the permanent status of this row, the objective of maintaining this block of New Jersey Avenue as a major vista is held in common. It is our view that private ownership and residential use on both sides is the far-preferable route to preserving the balanced vista of today, and that specific legislative assurance is now needed to protect this possibility.

Conclusion

The Master Plan, despite flaws, can be a valuable legacy from this Congress to the Nation. This will almost certainly be its future if it is adopted with a commitment to its success. The alternative, periods of unplanned self-restraint followed by episodes of scarcely-planned expansion, has more than run its course as a public philosophy. We urge you to move beyond it by amending and then passing H.R. 4332.

Exhibit 1

Capitol Hill Restoration Society
April 13, 1977

RESOLUTION

The Capitol Hill Restoration Society has a longstanding interest in the evolution of the U. S. Capitol, both as a working institution and as a major national monument. In keeping with this interest, designated representatives of the Society and a number of its individual members have given close attention to the master planning process being conducted by the Architect of the Capitol and his consultants under the mandate of Public Law 94-59. Much of the information which the Society has gained has come to it by virtue of three informational presentations by the Architect and the consultants; the Society wishes to convey its appreciation for the time given to conducting such sessions by those involved in the planning process.

Now, as a result of these and other efforts, the Society concludes that enough is known about the preliminary work to allow those who have kept close watch to offer constructive, hopefully timely, comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the Master Plan process as it has been carried out to date. Accordingly, after discussion and deliberation at a regular meeting of the members, the Society has endorsed the following points and resolutions.

1. Support for study of long-term space needs. The Society, including many present and former members of the U. S. Capitol working community, recognizes and accepts the need for improvements in working conditions and space utilization in the Capitol complex. It therefore supports the mandate of PL. 94-59 which directs the Architect to explore space utilization alternatives within the existing Capitol Grounds, in the adjacent area, and on appropriate sites not adjacent to the Capitol Grounds. The Society feels however that the first and third branches of the mandate have received insufficient emphasis in the planning process to date. The Society is also concerned that the planning process has centered on the House and has not addressed in corresponding detail the future needs of the Senate the Library, and the Supreme Court.

2. Integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District. The Master Plan must respect the recently-designated Capitol Hill Historic District as the permanent setting for Congress as both a functioning and monumental institution. Because maintenance of the Historic District is largely entrusted to small private owners who must look to non-governmental sources for improvement capital, it is important that the Plan recognize the integrity of boundaries between the Historic District and Capitol uses. Failure to acknowledge stable borders will reduce private commitment to preserving the Historic District, thus subjecting the critical boundary

to short range and shifting uses. This outcome will be equally to the detriment of Congress and the surrounding area.

3. Maintenance of existing residential areas. Although this position is expressed elsewhere in other ways, the Society wishes to state unequivocally its firm opposition to any taking of residential property in the Historic District, whether for conversion or demolition, until all other space has been planned for, utilized, and found inadequate to the actual needs of Congress and the Supreme Court.

4. Efforts of House Commission and Municipal Planning Office endorsed. The Society endorses the conclusions and methods of the House Commission on Information and Facilities, and asks that Master Plan findings made prior to release of the Commission Report now be reassessed to incorporate and reflect the results of the Congressional study. The Society also commends the Municipal Planning Office for its contributions on behalf of a successful Master Plan, particularly the nine "Basic Concepts" to govern the Master Plan, formulated in its Discussion Document of December 10, 1976.

5. Preliminary Master Plan survey identifies prime area for improvement. The Preliminary Survey toward a Master Plan singles out the area north of the Southwest Freeway, including the recessed right of way of the Center Leg Freeway, as blighted and pre-eminently available for additional Capitol construction outside the present grounds. The Society supports this appraisal and strongly encourages the Architect to focus in the later stages of the planning process on the opportunities, as well as the problems, peculiar to this area.

6. North-South axis approved. The Society agrees that, when and if realistic growth projections warrant plans for future expansion of the Capitol Grounds south of D Street, the axis for such a design should lie along the South Capitol Street Corridor, but should not necessarily center on it. Further, the Society urges that the Master Plan approach this region with the purpose of assisting the MPO, Metro, and other land and transportation planning agencies to bring about needed improvement in that portion of the corridor which lies South of the Southwest Freeway.

7. Sequence to be followed in siting new construction. The Society is of the opinion that the alternative sites for new buildings suggest a clear and orderly progression which should be followed in actual construction over the next several decades. First, the square containing the Congressional Hotel should be the site of the next new building. Simultaneously or thereafter, the sites now containing the underground garages, and the adjacent surface parking lot between C and D Streets should be permanently committed to office rather than parking use. Retention of the

present use will only perpetuate the mistakes of the early 60's and mar the final legacy of the Master Plan. Parking sites lost in this process which need to be replaced should be relocated over the Center Leg, or to the Southwest, outside the essential perimeter reserved for rapid access to the House floor. All useable sites south of D Street and west of South Capitol Street should be acquired and committed before any taking is contemplated which would involve existing residences in the Historic District.

9. Parking should be displaced from sites with access to House floor. The Society believes that the key to a far-sighted and durable Master Plan is the recognition that new transportation methods must and will displace most private automobiles in the area of the present Capitol Grounds. Accordingly, while we commend the planners' efforts to explore the potential for a linear transit system across the Capitol complex, we also urge a total reappraisal of future automobile use, and of the needs for members' staffs to have assigned free parking locations inside the main perimeter of the grounds.

10. Moratorium on certain new construction. The Society endorses the consultants' recommendation that a moratorium be imposed on new buildings in the unconstrained areas West and South of the existing grounds. If this result can only be achieved by an exercise of eminent domain, the Society would support a limited purpose resolution to accomplish the necessary taking with full and just compensation.

11. Recognition of a community advisory organization. The Survey toward a Master Plan contemplates a Community Advisory Organization which would be formally involved in the development of the Master Plan. The Society strongly recommends that such a committee now be recognized in order to bring the interest and considerable abilities of the community into the planning process on a standing basis. By its visibility and permanence, this committee can help assure that the most informed and constructive contributions will reach the planners.

12. Premises of Master Plan require fundamental re-examination. While retaining faith in the original concept of the Master Plan, the Society has reluctantly concluded that the effort to date will yield a defective and short-lived product unless several fundamental changes are introduced.

a. Future space requirements for the House of Representatives have been estimated by extending straight line projections from the staff increases occurring during the past 10 or 20 years. This has led to the conclusion that the present House office space must be doubled during the next building cycle, or by 1990. The Society believes that the serious challenges already made to this

analysis warrant its prompt abandonment. Although it is not credible, politically or otherwise, the straight line projection threatens large areas of the bordering community and thus frustrates the stabilizing aims of the Master Plan mandate.

b. Miscalculations of automobile use and parking needs can radically distort total space requirements and siting decisions. Assumptions used on both counts have been severely and convincingly questioned in public sessions; an alternative analysis should now be provided in which they are revised substantially downward.

c. Alternative scenarios for House expansion show no coordination with transportation uses and land planning in the South Capitol Street Corridor. Failure to plan for diversion of South Capitol Street traffic in those plans which close Canal Street calls into question the adequacy of Master Plan work to date. Other alternatives show wholesale taking and removal of residences which are within the Historic District, and thus constrained, while unconstrained land remains undeveloped. This is inconsistent with both the announced planning criteria and the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. In the Society's opinion it also weakens the case for the Master Plan as a good faith, politically acceptable, response to the planning mandate.

The Society believes these deficiencies can be remedied, and that existing funds should be reallocated to that effort as a matter of urgent priority. If funds are not available, the shortcomings can be overlooked or concealed only at the cost of jeopardizing the plan; in that event the Society hopes that the Architect will openly acknowledge the need for further study and actively pursue a supplemental appropriation to assure it.

THE CAPITOL HILL RESTORATION SOCIETY Exhibit 2

Resolution

1. The Society wishes to commend and thank the Capitol Master Plan design group for its close consideration of the views of the Capitol Hill community as expressed in meetings and workshops during 1976-7, and embodied in the May 1977 Statement of Principles, summarized at page 6 of "Toward a Master Plan."

2. The Society particularly endorses three aspects of the proposed Plan:

a. its general respect for the integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District;

b. its resolution in favor of smaller, less monumental structures and creative landscaping at points of contact with the residential community;

c. the concern shown to protect surrounding residential areas from the pressures of high-density development.

3. Recognizing that the planning process is once again at the stage where constructive community response can enhance the value and permanence of the eventual Plan, the Society wishes to express three traditional and fundamental concerns:

a. that the proposed Plan be revised to protect residential buildings and uses on the West side of the 400 block of New Jersey Avenue, S.E., employing architectural and landscape buffering to screen or differentiate the rear yards of these structures. This step would preserve the historic use of the avenue and maintain the balance and symmetry of an important remaining vista toward the Capitol. The Society feels this can be done with little or no impairment of either the workspace or the amenities proposed for this square in the current draft of the Plan;

b. that the planning group's desirable objective of land use and facade controls in the Second Street and other transition streets abutting the Capitol should be carefully worked out with community participation, so that the controls finally adopted represent the least obtrusive measures required to achieve the common interests of the Capitol and the Historic District;

c. that the Methodist Building be treated as worthy of preservation at least to the extent that it should not be demolished solely to provide a new green park area.

4. The Society commits its resources and energies to work with the planning group and other community organizations to resolve constructively the remaining omissions or shortcomings of the proposed Plan. To this end, and because the Plan is now only a graphic presentation, the Society expresses its firm opinion that a workable number of community representatives should be invited to review and comment on the proposed text of the Plan during the final drafting process. As the September 8th community orientation meeting did not include such an opportunity, the Society believes this additional step is essential to genuine community consultation during Phase III of the Plan.

(Resolution adopted unanimously by the Society at its regular membership meeting 9/10/80)

Exhibit 3

CAPITOL HILL RESTORATION SOCIETY INC

TASK FORCE ON THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN

A RESOLUTION

Resolved, that the Capitol Hill Restoration Society expresses its approval of and support for the principal findings and recommendations of the Master Plan for the U.S. Capitol , including its respect for the integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District, its planned sequence for any future office building construction, and the proposal to zone a Capitol Interest District in order to stabilize the character of the surrounding area;

Resolved further, that the Society expresses its strong reservations concerning the proposal to transfer, from the District of Columbia to the Architect of the Capitol jurisdiction over space up to the building lines of private dwellings within the transition or boundary zone envisioned by the Plan. The Society believes that the purposes of the Transition Zone may be fully achieved if the transfer of jurisdiction is limited to the space lying outside the fence lines of lands in the Transition Zone.

(Adopted by the April, 1982 Meeting of the Board of Directors, April 7, 1982);(Adopted by the April 14, 1982 Meeting of the Membership)

TASK FORCE ON THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN: THOMAS P. ALDER, *CHAIRMAN*, ALICE BELLIS, PAUL HAYES, LAWRENCE MONACO, JOHN PONTIUS, PETER POWERS, CAROL SANTOS, THOMAS SIMMONS, RICHARD WOLF

Mr. YOUNG. Please proceed.

**TESTIMONY OF THOMAS P. ALDER, CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN, CAPITOL HILL RESTORATION SOCIETY, INC.**

Mr. ALDER. Thank you, sir.

I should explain, that the name of this organization, the task force on master plan, does unintentionally duplicate the name of the AIA's own similar reviewing organization.

In 1977, the Restoration Society formed the task force on the master plan. It has functioned from that date forward to this, as the main community organization reviewing and participating in the master plan process.

Our appearance is to endorse the bill today with three express changes or amendments, and to endorse with very few reservations the master plan as presented in 1981, which we find has remarkably matured during the evolution of its 6-year design or development stage.

It is hard to imagine another prior plan which has had longer gestation period, and, as a result, has had the advantage that this master plan has had of revised transportation projection and revised staff growth expectations. Both of these have rendered the plan both smaller and more suited to the scale of Capitol Hill.

If I may, I will refer quickly to the three changes which we have in our statement suggested, because I think they are the crux of our testimony.

There is a provision in section 7 of the bill which would give the Architect, as the bill is now written, jurisdiction over the yards in front of the Houses and other buildings lying across the street from the Capitol Grounds. The purpose of this provision is to assist implementation of the streetscaping elements of the plan.

The community we represent have consistently taken the position that this sweeping step far exceeds the requirements of the tasks that the Architect has to undertake, and we have recommended that the transfer of jurisdiction extend only to the edge of the sidewalk farthest from the curb.

Language has been prepared by the Architect's Office which may very well meet this concern. I want to call the attention of the committee and the staff to it, although I am not sure it has been presented yet for the record.

It would deal with this question as we have raised it and discussed it with the Architect over the last year or so. It goes without saying that if experience in implementing the master plan provisions of H.R. 4332 turns out to be too difficult without this greater transfer of jurisdiction, we would support hearings at which the problems with the existing implementation could be raised and, if warranted, an extension of the jurisdiction granted as the Architect is requesting. But only in that event, only if it is required.

Our suggested amendment is that this jurisdiction transfer be limited to the area between the curbs and the inside of the sidewalks. The problems with the larger taking are, I think, quite real.

The first that I think is recognized by all is that if we have shared jurisdiction or cosovereignty over this area between the Ar-

chitect and the District of Columbia, there is going to be confusion and that confusion is bound to redound in the first instance to the detriment of the people who live there, and second perhaps even to the Capitol. This is because if there is a withholding reduction of city services to these areas, I think that the Congress is going to then bear a greater burden for undertaking maintenance. The friction losses in this kind of conflict just don't seem to warrant the offsetting costs.

The other thing to mention about the bill is that it includes the Architect as a new member of the Commission on Fine Arts for matters arising in the Capitol Interest District. If he sits on that Board, he is in a position to amply protect the Capitol interests in any facade alterations or new constructions that occur in these buildings directly across from the Capitol Grounds.

So we rather strongly suggest language that would restrict, as the Architect's Office has now provided, restrict this jurisdiction transfer in the first instance to the sidewalks in the side of the street directly opposing Capitol Grounds.

The second recommendation we make is one which I think follows directly on testimony we have just heard, and from the Architect's presentation today. All proponents of the plan expect, indeed, hope that there will be periodic review of the plan over the life span.

Therefore we feel it is a significant omission in the bill as currently written to omit or lack any provision for a periodic report to Congress. It is our feeling that some of the concerns that have been expressed—about the plan taking on a life of its own, or fears that the implementation measures will be too broad or too modest for the purpose—that these can be addressed if there is an annual or biannual reporting requirement. Without that, it is very likely that years will turn into decades, or at least that months will turn into years. This has happened in the past in this process, and could again if there will not be a regularized and routine reporting mechanism.

It is not a great deal to ask to impose a reporting requirement on something of this size. If from year to year no changes have occurred in the implementation of the plan, a very brief report can be filed to that effect. If, on the other hand, a good bit more has happened, I think it ought to be revealed, it ought to be brought to the attention of Congress and the committees of primary jurisdiction.

I think it will make it easier for the Architect and his successors to bring about an implementation of the master plan that is really in keeping with the intentions of the Congress of the period.

The final recommendation we make is the most difficult to implement, because it would entail an excision of part of the master plan as it was presented here today, by way of legislative history, in the committee report or in a notation accompanying the bill. At least it would probably entail that kind of an action.

But the matter is one that has been of serious concern to the community from the very inception of the plan. And that is the intention in the last phase of the master plan to take current residential properties in the historic district. These lie on the west side of New Jersey Avenue, in the 400 block, square 693.

The master planners, and particularly the Architect, have gone a great deal of the distance in meeting the objections of those living in this area and the community generally. They have provided that these buildings may in the end by used for residential or limited office use and possibly even leased back on a leased basis or for life estates. The consideration that the planning group has shown has also extended to phasing eventual buildings to include this row of houses in the very last stage of any eventual construction.

While recognizing that this is quite a concession, we are still constrained to disagree with the proposition that this one row of residential buildings in the historic district, should ever go into public ownership for office use. The final plans support this position, we feel. They show that the main buildings in this square will center on an internal plaza—if you will remember from the slides—with the eastern-most of the buildings that would be included among the major buildings in that plaza backing up on the rear of the residential row on the west side of New Jersey Avenue.

It appears to us that the overall design of this outer edge of the Capitol Grounds leaves these buildings on New Jersey Avenue as more or less outsiders to the Capitol Grounds and to the major design. To include them as office buildings, either by new construction which simulates them or conversion to office space, seems to us an improvisation in view of the larger and more solid achievements of the master plan in other respects. It is also probably worth noting that this space is likely to be expensive to acquire and will yield relatively little in efficient space if it is acquired.

The concern the community now feels about these buildings is that if there is no clarification of their status, stabilization of their characteristics and their use and the level of maintenance which can be expected to be given to them in the next 50 to 75 years will be in doubt. There are pressures even today to change some of these uses. For this reason, we feel there is some urgency about dealing with this question at the time the master plan is adopted and not at some later time.

The request we make, and it is detailed somewhat more specifically in my prepared statement, is that the legislative history should express in an annotation to section 2 that it is the impression and understanding of the committee that this one row of residential houses will not be taken into the master plan. The objectives in doing this are the same as those expressed by the plan, which is to maintain New Jersey Avenue as the one remaining major L'Enfant plan vista from the south that can be preserved and maintained in perpetuity.

The master plan, despite these flaws, is a valuable legacy from this Congress to the Nation, and will certainly be so if it is adopted with a commitment to its success. The alternative, as we have seen, for the last decade, which is to have periods of unplanned self-restraint, followed by episodes of equally unplanned expansion, has now more than run its course as a public philosophy. Planning of the kind represented by the master plan is the minimum framework within which to expect rational growth management for the Capitol of the future.

We, therefore, urge an amendment in the three respects mentioned and passage of H.R. 4332.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Alder, thank you for your statement. I will instruct the staff to review your proposed amendments to see if we can incorporate some of them into the legislation which we hope we would try to move ahead early next year.

I have one question. In your statement you make reference to square 693. In this regard, as you are aware, I am sure, the Congress has acquired half of the property in square 693, commonly referred to as Carr property. However, we need to pass legislation to acquire the remaining half.

Does the Capitol Hill Restoration Society support Congress in acquiring the remaining half, at this time?

Mr. ALDER. Just so the record is entirely clear what we are talking about: We are not talking about the portion of 693 north and south that has residences on it, but rather the unit of land in 693 south called the Carr property, owned by the Ivy Street Development Corp. We have appeared before this committee as recently as the spring of this year in support of an authorization to take the remainder of that land. We appeared in the first instance when it was up for authorization. We have appeared on three occasions before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to urge funding for the full acquisition of this land.

That position has not changed, Mr. Chairman. We very strongly support that.

Mr. YOUNG. That is fine. Because it is one of the few things that is still pending. I would sure like to take care of pending problems during the time that I have the opportunity to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. Hopefully, everybody will be able to resolve that, because I think it is an integral part of moving ahead on this plan. At least if we can decide that, and then take a look at the question that you raise about west New Jersey Avenue, the row of houses in that area.

Hopefully, we can resolve that in the very, very near future.

Mr. Alder, thank you very much. We appreciate your continuing interest in the Capitol Building and the Grounds relative to the master plan. Hopefully we can move ahead early next year in resolving this question.

If there are no other questions, without objection, the hearing is closed on H.R. 4332. We will keep the record open for additional statements.

Thank you all very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.]

[The following additional items were received for the record:]

COMMITTEE OF 100 ON THE FEDERAL CITY
1307 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

FOUNDED 1923

December 5, 1983

The Honorable Robert A. Young, Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds
Committee on Public Works and Transportation
U.S. House of Representatives
2165 Rayburn Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

RE: H.R. 4332

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am enclosing a resolution in support of the "Master Plan for Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas" and recommending amendments to the implementing legislation. This resolution was unanimously endorsed by the membership of our Committee at its regular meeting on November 17, 1983.

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City is the oldest planning group in Washington. It has served for more than sixty years as a citizens' forum on the principal planning issues of the Federal City and its environs, attracting to its membership architects, planning consultants, landscape architects, conservationists, preservationists, and others who are concerned with Washington planning problems.

We have frequently presented statements before the National Capital Planning Commission, the Joint Committee on Landmarks (now the Historic Preservation Review Board), the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts. Recently we have focused our attention and resources on the joint Federal-local comprehensive planning process. We believe that the proposed Capitol grounds plan, with the perfecting amendments mentioned, will facilitate the comprehensive planning process, and furthermore that the Capitol grounds plan will become a worthy companion to the earlier outstanding plans for our capital city: the L'Enfant Plan and the McMillan Plan.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit our views on these plans for the Capitol grounds which are of great importance not only to the immediate neighbors of the Capitol but to each resident of the District, and of the National Capital Region.

Sincerely yours,

David Grinnell

David Grinnell
Chairman

Enclosure
DG:rr

Committee of 100 on the Federal City
Meeting of the Membership
November 17, 1983

RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Committee of 100 on the Federal City commends the Architect of the Capitol and all those contributing to the Master Plan for the U.S. Capitol for the general excellence of the final plan and its fidelity to the tradition of earlier plans. The Committee particularly endorses the Plan's determination that Capitol Hill has a finite environmental capacity, and that maintaining the integrity of the Capitol Hill Historic District is a goal inextricably related to the future of the Capitol complex itself. The Committee is also encouraged by the Plan's commitment to restoration of the Olmsted landscape design of the Capitol Grounds, and by the steps proposed to eliminate surface parking and to create a North-South rail link across the grounds.

While endorsing the Plan, the Committee notes with approval several perfecting amendments to the implementing legislation (H.R. 4332) offered by the Master Plan Task Force representing residents of the Historic District. These appear consistent with the general aims of the Plan, and the Committee therefore urges inclusion of the following measures:

1. A provision should be made for a periodic report to Congress by the Architect of the Capitol on the implementation of the Plan. The Committee recommends that this report be no less frequent than once every two years.

2. On streets bordering the Capitol Grounds, the transfer of jurisdiction to the Architect of the Capitol should extend only to the space between the far curb and the far edge of the sidewalk. This appears adequate to enable completion of the streetscaping elements of the Plan.

3. A statement should be included in the legislative history of the pending bill to express the intent that the row houses and associated

lots on the West side of the 400 block of New Jersey Avenue, S.E., shall not be acquired or incorporated into the Capitol Grounds as a part of the Plan. The Committee believes that a strong commitment to private ownership and preservation of this row is essential to protect the L'Enfant Plan's vista in the direction of the Capitol. The Committee also sees the row as not essential to the large square to be formed by the buildings constituting the final stage of the plan for the South edge.

With these changes, the Committee can strongly support the Plan.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DEPUTY MAYOR FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. — Room 401
Washington, D.C. 20004

November 25, 1983

Honorable Robert Young
Chairman
Subcommittee on Public
Buildings and Grounds
Committee on Public Works
and Transportation
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Young:

Please find attached the statement of John H. McKoy, Director, Office of Planning for inclusion in the record of hearings on H.R. 4332 relating to the Master Plan for the United States Capitol.

Sincerely,

Curtis McClinton, Jr.
Deputy Mayor for
Economic Development

Enclosures (25)

DC ON THE GROW

TESTIMONY OF
JOHN H. MCKOY, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF PLANNING
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION
ON H.R. 4332
NOVEMBER 15, 1983

IT GIVES ME GREAT PLEASURE TO SUBMIT TO YOU TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4332. IF PASSED THIS BILL WOULD ENABLE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ATTAIN GOALS FOR AN HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT AND IMPORTANT SECTION OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL. ADOPTION OF THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN WILL GIVE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT A SET OF POLICIES PROVIDING FOR GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND RENOVATION OF CAPITOL HILL CONSISTENT WITH THE DISTRICT'S PLANNING POLICIES FOR ADJACENT AREAS. THE MASTER PLAN AND THE DISTRICT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, NOW UNDER CITY COUNCIL REVIEW, WILL GIVE BOTH GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS COMPATIBLE POLICIES FOR THE CAPITOL GROUNDS AND THE ADJACENT CAPITOL HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT. OF THE MAJOR THEMES CONTAINED IN THE DISTRICT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION, PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL AMENITIES, AND IMPROVING THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER OF THE CITY ARE MOST CLOSELY RELATED TO THEMES IN THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN. FURTHERMORE, THE DISTRICT'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONTAINS AN HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT BASED, IN PART, ON PRECEPTS OF THE L'ENFANT AND McMILLAN PLANS. THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT PROVIDES POLICIES SPECIFICALLY INTENDED TO PROTECT THE LANDMARKS, HISTORIC DISTRICTS, AND NEIGHBORHOODS SIGNIFICANT TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL.

THE U.S. CAPITOL MASTER PLAN IS BASED ON PREMISES WHICH ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THE DISTRICT'S LONG RANGE PLANNING CONCEPTS. THE MASTER PLAN ENCOURAGES FUTURE DEVELOPMENT TO SHOW DEFERENCE TO THE HISTORIC HERITAGE OF THE CAPITOL, ITS GROUNDS AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS, PARTICUALRLY THE CAPITOL HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT. THE MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDS THAT MEASURES BE TAKEN TO ENSURE ITS CONTINUATION AS A RESIDENTIAL AREA. THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, OPEN SPACES AND LANDSCAPED AREAS SHOULD BE PRESERVED, ALLOWING IDENTIFICATION OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, BUT ADHERING TO THE SYMBOLIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CAPITOL AND THE CITY.

THE MASTER PLAN WILL SERVE AS A PHYSICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL, CAREFULLY MINIMIZING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT THROUGH THE PROPOSED OVERLAY ZONE AND USE OF 2ND STREET AND NEW JERSEY AVENUE AS PLAN BOUNDARIES. THE OVERLAY ZONE, TO EXTEND ALONG 2ND STREET FROM UNION STATION TO THE SOUTHEAST FREEWAY, WILL NOT EFFECT THE PREDOMINANT MODERATE DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-4) ZONE OF THE CAPITOL HILL COMMUNITY. IT WILL LIMIT ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT TO ESTABLISHED HEIGHT AND SCALE ACCORDING TO EXISTING ZONING REQUIREMENTS. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT STEP IN MAINTAINING THE PHYSICAL AND HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF THE CAPITOL HILL AREA. LONG RANGE GROWTH FORECASTS FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL PRECLUDE THE NEED TO ACQUIRE PRIVATE PROPERTY. THE ONLY POSSIBLE EXCEPTION TO THIS POLICY WOULD BE ON THE WEST SIDE OF NEW JERSEY AVENUE, S.E. IF NEED IS SUBSTANTIATED, ADAPTIVE REUSE OF STRUCTURES WOULD BE MADE TO PRESERVE COMMUNITY INTEGRITY. THE MASTER PLAN ALSO PROPOSES USE NEW SIDEWALK, FENCES AND WALLS COMPATIBLE WITH THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE HOUSES, REFURBISHING LANDSCAPING, AND ESTABLISHING DESIGN CRITERIA FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION

TO FURTHER DISTINGUISH AND IMPROVE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES.

WE FEEL THAT TRANSPORTATION NEEDS HAVE ALSO BEEN ADDRESSED BY LIMITING VEHICULAR ACCESS TO THE CAPITOL GROUNDS WHILE RECOMMENDING INCREASED USE OF THE CAPITOL SOUTH METRO STATION AND UNION STATION.

THE MASTER PLAN IS PARTICULARLY SENSITIVE TO ARCHITECTURAL SCALE, VISUAL IMPACT, HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT. THE PLAN HAS TAKEN GREAT CARE TO BALANCE AESTHETICS WITH THE SPACE NEEDS OF THE CONGRESS.

THE PLAN HAS SENSITIVELY COMBINED THE NEEDS AND ASPIRATIONS OF VARIOUS, POTENTIALLY COMPETING INTERESTS. THE OFFICE OF PLANNING SUPPORTS PASSAGE OF H.R. 4332.

○